REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 234 JC 680 000
COMMUNITY COLLEGES 1966, A NATIONAL SEMINAR ON THE COMMUNITY
COLLEGE IN CANADA (TORONTO, MAY 30-JUNE 1, 1966).
BY- THOMAS, ALAN M.
CANADIAN ASSN. FOR ADULT EDUCATION
PUB DATE 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.88 120P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE ROLE, POST SECONDARY EDUCATION, *ADULT EDUCATION, *FOREIGN COUNTRIES, *CURRICULUM PLANNING, *PROGRAM PLANNING, VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, TECHNICAL EDUCATION, CANADA,

THIS REPORT ILLUSTRATES THE DIFFERENCES IN PHILOSOPHY AND FUNCTION BETWEEN AMERICAN AND CANADIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AS WELL AS VARIATIONS AMONG THE CANADIAN PROVINCES. THE ONTARIO PROGRAM, DESCRIBED IN MOST DETAIL, IS AN EXAMPLE OF ONE PHILOSOPHY, IT HAS A 2-YEAR PROGRAM APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY, BUT ITS PROGRAM IN THE 18 REGIONAL COLLEGES IS MAINLY VOCATIONAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL. IT OFFERS A 3-YEAR ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY COURSE, 2-YEAR TECHNICIAN COURSES, 1- TO 3-YEAR BUSINESS COURSES, AND OCCUPATIONALLY ORIENTED APPLIED AND LIBERAL ARTS COURSES. REPRESENTATIVES FROM OTHER PROVINCES OUTLINED THE PHILOSOPHY, STRUCTURE, AND GOVERNANCE OF THEIR INSTITUTIONS. TOPICS DISCUSSED BY THE PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED (1) CLASSES FOR UPGRADING JOBS, (2) COURSES OF INTEREST TO THOSE WITH LEISURE, (3) STUDENT ROLE IN POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION, ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS, AND CHOICE OF CURRICULUM CONTENT, (4) ROLE OF SCHOOL BOARDS, (5) ADVISABILITY OF A THIRD JURISDICTION OR ONE CONNECTED TO THE HIGH SCHOOL AND/OR UNIVERSITY, (6) ACADEMIC, GENERAL, OR VOCATIONAL ORIENTATION OF A COLLEGE, (7) TRANSFER STANDARDS, (8) FINANCING METHODS, (9) DANGERS OF DUPLICATION OF EFFORT, AND (10) FACULTY ATTITUDES TO PROFESSIONAL STATUS. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FOR $2.00 FROM THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION FOR ADULT EDUCATION, CORBETT HOUSE, 21/3 SULTAN STREET, TORONTO 5, ONTARIO. (HH)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

QUESTIONS ASKED

1. Instructor makes himself/herself available for individual conferences?

2. Shows awareness of the fact that many students may not be majoring in the subject or closely related fields?

3. Contribution to students gaining knowledge of course material?

4. Stimulates individual analysis and creativity?

5. Organization of course material?

6. Presentation of subject matter clear and concise?

7. Quizzes and midterms are well designed and reflect course material?

8. Impartial grading of tests, quizzes and submitted material?

pec
67-493-43

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ERIC

ED017234

COMMUNITY COLLEGES 1966

A NATIONAL SEMINAR ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN CANADA

May 30, 31 and June 1, 1966 - Toronto

Second Edition $2

JC 680 000

The Canadian Association for Adult Education,
"Corbett House",
21/3 Sultan Street, Toronto, 5.

..TABLE OF CONTENTS..

Page Number

Conference Sponsors

Introduction

Conference Chairman 1

The Community College in a Complex Society 3

Response Panel 10

College of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario 20

Panel on Administration and Curriculum Development 28

Questions arising from Group Discussion 55

Summary 66

Panel on Teachers and Teaching 68

Questions arising from Group Discussion 79

Financing of Community Colleges 91

Questions from the Floor 101

Conference Summary 106

Participants

****

Sponsored by:-

The Canadian Association for Adult Education,
in co-operation with ....

Association of Universities and Colleges
in Canada

Canadian Association of Superintendents and
School Inspectors

Canadian Association of University Teachers

Canadian Education Association

Canadian School Trustees Association

Canadian Teachers Federation

INTRODUCTION

This report represents the second major event sponsored by the CAAE focussed on Community Colleges in Canada. The first was our National Conference of June, 1965 at which we devoted our attention more narrowly to the prospects for adult education in these emerging institutions. These two reports plus the admirable summary of developments contained in Andrew Stewart's report to the Government of Alberta, "Special Study on Junior Colleges", and Leonard Marsh's study of a College for Vancouver Island, make a valuable collection of documents for anyone interested in this important evolution in Canada's education.

The CAAE's persisent interest in these new institutions is easily explained. Despite the fact that no government in Canada has yet formally identified these institutions as Community Colleges, the title continues to be used informally and we are content so far that this should be so. Our concern is that as much attention and thought should be given to the word 'community' as to the word 'college'. If this can be done, in the face of powerful tendencies to jam this unique institution somehow into the existing educational structure without altering it, then in our view there is an impressive opportunity to evolve a genuine system of continuing education for Canada.

The statement from Dr. Stewart that the best way of disciplining ourselves in developing these institutions is to examine a number of educational functions that must be performed in Canada, and then build the institutions around them, is, in our opinion, the key to the entire development. For the first time perhaps in 50 years we have the clear opportunity to create an institution to suit our needs rather than to continue to try to adapt existing institutions to new problems.

In reviewing the material developed by the seminar, one is entitled to some hope that such pioneering in Canadian education is possible. Despite the understandable tendency to see the Colleges' purposes only in terms of the young, or only in terms of existing institutions - the tiresome question of transfer for example, - there appears to be on all sides a promising willingness to experiment, to re-think our habits, and to allow some novel shapes and functions to emerge. The immediate leadership attached to these Colleges, the degree to which our populations are willing to accept new educational goals and avenues, in the next two to three years will be crucial.

The CAAE intends to maintain its interest in the Colleges and to provide whatever help we can. Such matters as the self-identification of staff of the Colleges, the opportunities for College staffs and administrations for exchange of ideas and results, will perhaps be areas in which the CAAE, and the co-operating agencies can be of continuing assistance.

We would like to thank our co-operating agencies, and in particular, the Laidlaw Foundation of Ontario for assistance in providing the simultaneous translation and Canadian Bechtel Limited for a cruicial grant. Many individuals contributed to the preparation of the seminar and its proceedings. Presumably they share with us the satisfaction of participating in this most fundamental of extensions, learning about the care and nourishment of learning.

Alan M. Thomas

September, 1966
"CORBETT HOUSE"

NATIONAL SEMINAR ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN CANADA

Dr. Garnet Page: General Conference Chairman

This Conference is sponsored by the Canadian Association for Adult Education in co-operation with a number of national organizations concerned with ensuring maximum educational opportunity for all Canadians. And, by all Canadians I refer not only to our children who follow the usual and formal paths through primary and secondary school, but also those who have been unable to navigate this course and are now either young or mature adult members of our national manpower, as well as those who have completed secondary education and who, at any subsequent time, wish to proceed to further education.

The primary objective of this Conference is to acknowledge that the Community College is a new concept. The words "Community College" are generic and denote a system of education that is a break-out from the traditional formal pattern of primary, secondary and post-secondary (tertiary) education.

The Community College provides the opportunity to serve the community in a new, unique and extremely important way, and this has been discussed at an earlier conference.

One year ago the Canadian Association for Adult Education convened a conference on Adult Education in Community Colleges. At this three-day meeting in Ottawa, 116 people, including 26 participants and 90 registrants, discussed the objectives and roles of the new colleges and how they should be used. The conference provided a good deal of background information and served as a forum for debate and exchange of ideas.

The proceedings of this conference demonstrated that there was indeed a very wide range of opinion about the possibilities and implications facing those who desire to make their Community Colleges invaluable additions to higher education in Canada.

In Dr. Alan Thomas' summary of the reports of last year's conference, he noted that the great appeal of the Community College lies partly in that it is a comprehensive institution, and that it is now possible for two separate traditions of liberal and academic education and technical and vocational education to come together in one institution - the Community College - as well as for the two separate traditions or organized, disciplined regular educational procedures and of the irregulated, diffuse and spontaneous processes of adult education to be combined.

And it is because the Community College can bring together these two pairs of vastly different traditions that there are many differences of view about their best organization, financing, objectives and utilization.

I suggest that experience will demonstrate that there is no one "best" method to combine all of these important factors, but that a range of "best" Community Colleges will develop in Canada, each designed to satisfy the conditions and needs of the area and people which it serves.

Another primary objective is to discuss those areas and problems relating to Community Colleges which are not yet decided or solved, to exchange experiences and philosophies and to bring forth ideas which may assist in their best solution.

I trust that this Conference will not be construed as an attempt to arrive at any one single concept regarding Community Colleges in Canada. We are all aware of the different experiences in the various provinces and it is from this variety of experience that the exchange of information and the process of learning from each other should be of value.

Leland L. Medsker: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education,
University of California, Berkeley

The Community College in a Complex Society

A problem confronting every province or state throughout the world is how best to provide educational opportunities for its people. Once this problem related primarily to the elementary school level. Then it spread to the secondary level as well. And although elementary and secondary education have by no means become universal in all nations, the problem of education at the post-secondary level is now becoming exceedingly crucial. It is within the context of educational opportunity beyond the secondary school that these remarks are made. The plan is to refer briefly to some of the broad social forces which give rise to the problems of higher education: to follow this with a discussion of certain basic questions or problem areas in higher education; to move then for illustrative purposes to the situation in the United States, particularly to identify the role of the community college; and, finally to dwell briefly on a few general questions which must be faced by any province or state as it considers its educational obligations to older youth and adults.

Little if any documentation is needed to identify some of the forces which are changing the nature of society throughout the world. The two most obvious ones are population growth and the expansion of science and technology. Almost as obvious is the increasing social advance of the times, some of which stems from the other two forces, but which goes far beyond to account for such developments as the emergence of the human rights movement in its various forms throughout the world; the conflict in political ideologies between and among nations; the drive toward political independence within nations; and the increasing complexity of the civic and economic life everywhere. Robert Havighurst[1] has characterized these changes as "social processes" and has summarized them under five categories: (1) The expansion of human action in space and time; (2) mass production, automation, cybernation, and the changing significance of work; (3) metropolitanization; (4) world independence and co-operation; and (5) social integration.

It is unnecessary to dwell on these developments. They are apparent and real. Many of them have emerged within the last two decades. We are all caught up in the swift stream of their advance. Many of them are exciting and most of them are sobering in that they instil the uneasy question of whether we can cope with them or whether they - population growth, for example - may thwart the society of which they are a part.

---

[1] Havighurst, R. J., Social and Cultural Changes Molding the Future of the American People. A paper read at a U.C.E.A. Seminar at the State University of New York at Buffalo, October, 1965.

The impact of these forces on education is naturally great. As Havighurst has said, they operate in the closest interaction with our educational system. They depend on the educational system, and they transform it at the same time. Their relationship to higher education is felt in many ways. For one thing, the sheer increase in the number of people of college age means that, even with no increase in the percentage of students entering higher education, the load factor grows greater each year. But for many obvious reasons the need for an increasing percentage of youth to go beyond the secondary school, both for their own welfare and that of the society, accelerates constantly. Since this need is perceived by more and more people in the college-age group, the result is that each year an increasing percentage of youth aspire to enroll in college.

Such a combination of circumstances poses many problems for education beyond the secondary school. In the first place, there is the problem of access and opportunity. Frank Bowles in his book Access to High Education has documented this problem as it is found in many countries of the world. Even on the North American continent there is by no means universal opportunity for post-secondary education. Not only are there serious restraints imposed by insufficient college facilities, restricted educational programs, and poor geographical distribution of institutions, but there are even greater restraints stemming from the social and economic deprivations of many people. Moreover, the growing number of individuals interested in going to college, together with the current emphasis on quality, have resulted in numerous artificial barriers in the easy flow from school to college. Thus it is that in times when greater and greater emphasis is placed on higher education the opportunities for it become more limited for an increasing percentage of young people.

Another major problem is that of determining the nature of education at the collegiate level which best serves a complex society. The answer to such a question has not, of course, been found, nor may it become readily apparent even with much thought and effort. But unless it has continuous consideration, there is not likely to be any great change in college education or any likelihood that it will keep pace with the vast changes in society. At the March, 1966 Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Frank Bowles, now director of the educational program of the Ford Foundation, spoke to this point when he said:

> "This impressionistic description of our education evolution over the next few years makes a point that is not always clear. Democratization of education is not just the provision of more of the same. It is the process of increasing the capacity of an educational system by adding opportunities for study, to accommodate students who have heretofore been unable to find programs to suit their needs. It is not just educational improvement. It is social change. It has gone on in American education for a long time and given us reason to be proud of tolerance of innovation and freedom of opportunity.

> The philosophy on which this is all based is one we know well. It holds that we achieve knowledge and taste and competence and freedom, through education, and that through these attributes, we become prosperous and tolerant, abolishing poverty and racial struggle. It holds that education not only qualifies for jobs but itself actually creates new jobs, and changes of old ones. And holding these premises, it follows that through the continuous expansion of education, we will end discrimination and slums and inequality of opportunity and other social ills, and achieve the good life for everyone.
>
> This is the dual purpose revolution - a typically American affair - the undertaking of social uplift which fills a moral requirement for economic reasons. "

Then, after discussing both the advantages and problems involved in the democratization of higher education, Mr. Bowles concluded his address by saying:

> "To sum up - there are real dangers to educational standards within the educational revolution that is under way. But they are dangers we make ourselves. We may believe that this is revolution made in Washington, and indeed its visible center is there. But it was made in our own colleges and universities, in the minds of our students long before it was focussed and centered in Washington, and its next steps are being made now on our campuses in the minds of our students today. In the long run it is our colleges and universities that are the Board of Strategy for the revolution, by reason of the decisions they make, the actions they take, and the men they train. Only if we forget this are we in danger. "

These are sobering thoughts for those who must plan and control higher education in our times. I doubt that they are any less applicable to Canada and to other highly developed nations than they are to the United States.

Implied forcefully in the foregoing comments is the necessity for higher education to provide diversity of both programs and techniques in accommodating the new college generation. Immediately this raises the question of whether there should be a differentiation of function among higher institutions. This is a grave concern for planning as well as for co-ordination of colleges within any given political entity. It is a topic highly relevant to today's discussion.

Another related concern - and one also relevant to today's topice - is the geographical distribution of collegiate facilities and the degree to which colleges are located near the homes of students to be served. I shall return to this matter later. It is identified at this point only as one more concern in the total complex of higher education.

In the discussion so far we have omitted any reference to adult education. Obviously no one needs to build a case for adult education today. And although it is the obligation of many agencies, the institutions for higher education cannot disclaim their fair share of the responsibility. The subject will also be discussed presently.

With this as background, let us turn to the role of the community college in the higher education setting, particularly as it has developed in the United States. First I should say that all the social forces mentioned earlier are operating in the United States. Education at the secondary level has become universal to the point where more than 75 percent of young people graduate from high school - this compared with 6 percent in 1900.

Almost 50 percent of higher school graduates enter some type of post-high school institution. Today there are more than 5½ million people in college - a figure equal to approximately 40 percent of the college age group. Each of you is knowledgeable about the various types of colleges and universities in the United States, so I shall not describe them. You are aware that community colleges are becoming an exceedingly important segment of higher education. There are now almost 500 of these colleges in addition to approximately 270 independent two-year colleges. For the country as a whole, one in every four students entering college attends a junior or community college. In some states the proportion is much greater. In California, approximately 75 percent of all freshman or sophomore students in all of higher education are in the State's public community colleges. Moreover, the community college is the subject of increasing recognition and emphasis. In each state there have been recent commissions at work to consider the problem of how best to meet the needs of higher education, and almost without exception there has been a recommendation that increasing reliance be placed on the community college. States that have such colleges are expanding them, and states that until recently did not have them are now establishing them. Such institutions play a very important role in large cities, where in many cases eight or more separate campuses are in operation in order to serve the particular metropolitan community.

It is not the purpose of the paper, however, to extol the magnitude or the virtues of the community college in the United States. Rather, it is my responsibility to discuss some of the philosophical issues with regard to these colleges, particularly with respect to their role and function.

One cannot discuss any one segment of higher education without considering the impact of changing social forces on higher education generally. This is naturally the reason for the earlier comments on social change. To be more specific, I should like to suggest three generic functions of the community college - not the usual functions such as that of serving the transfer students and the like, although these will be mentioned - but, instead, certain broader concepts pertaining to the fundamental role of the community college.

1. Broadening the base for higher education

If it is true that in the society now emerging the vast majority of young people will both wish and need to pursue their education further, it follows that the range of interests and talents of the total college population will be similar to those of the population in general. To assume, therefore, that traditional college programs, geared primarily to students with intellectual orientations or to those headed for the professions, will suffice is undoubtedly in error. Surely we cannot fail these last two groups, and no one can deny the effort to make our colleges and universities more intellectually stimulating places. But we must realize that in the totality of higher education we will not be dealing alone with an educational elite. Just as our lower schools changed to accommodate all the children of all the people, so will our colleges have to change in order to accommodate the children of at least most of the people. Presumably, this does not suggest that every institution of higher education re-vamp its purpose and programs. In a planned system of higher education cannot there be sufficient differentiation among institutions to allow for concentration of efforts and for experimentation in curricula and methods of instruction? To the community colleges can be assigned certain programs and functions not commonly found in four-year institutions.

For one thing, as more students, many of them of average ability, aspire to transfer from the two-year colleges, there must be some institutions which can accommodate them. At the same time, it seems entirely appropriate for certain four-year institutions to remain highly selective both in terms of students and of programs.

Broadening the base for higher education also extends beyond the mere accommodation of a diverse regular student body, to include appropriate programs for adults and the rendering of special services to the community. At least the question can be raised as to whether some type of collegiate institution may not have to be called upon for these functions, particularly in view of the increasing complexity of services to adults. For various reasons, the community college seems admirably suited for many of these services, and it would seem that to use it as such would make for good planning.

2. Easing the problem of access to higher education

As noted earlier, restraints on access to higher education stem from many factors. However, one point is clear: to the extent that college opportunity can be provided at low cost close to where potential students reside, the more likely are the restraints to be eased. This is all the more likely to be true if the college in question (1) operates on an open-door policy and (2) provides a variety of programs suitable for a diverse clientele. As have other agencies, our Center has conducted some research on this matter. In one major, fairly massive study of some 10,000 high school graduates we found that in communities with community colleges, a higher percentage of high school graduates, particularly men, entered college than in communities with other types of colleges or with no college. While the community colleges drew from all levels of ability it was also true that in the communities with junior colleges the highest percentage of high ability graduates continued their education. The influence on college attendance of the community college was particularly great among middle and low socioeconomic groups. Of special interest was the fact that the community college drew heavily from the high ability group from lower socioeconomic levels. The easing of access appears to work in various ways. There is evidence that the mere presence of an open-door comprehensive college in a community tends to condition young people at an early age - and their parents too - to think and plan in terms of college. Since decisions about college are made at an increasingly early age, this factor is important.

3. Distributing students

Both the complexity and the magnitude of higher education today raise questions concerning the most appropriate general pattern of this enterprise. One such question is whether the mid-level, non-selective, comprehensive institution, offering work for transfer as well as programs leading to employment may not become a dominent segment of education between the secondary schools on the one hand and either the upper division of college or employment on the other. The possibility is under study and experimentation in many countries.

In his book A General Pattern for American Higher Education,[2] McConnell had this to say:

> "The ambiguity of the role of the unselective junior college is inherent in its service as a comprehensive community institution. In a hierarchical system of higher education, it protects every student's "right to try". In spite of its heterogeneous population, it is judged by one segment of its community, by many of its own faculty, and by the academic world in general by its ability to prepare students for successful work in four-year institutions. Another part of the community evaluates it by its effectiveness in supplying techniciansfor local industries, businesses, and professions. It is in effect a great distributive center, selecting after admission the students capable of succeeding in four-year colleges and giving them an academic regimen, while at the same time coping with the 'latent terminals' and encouraging as many of them as might profit from it to shift to an occupational curriculum. All this the junior college must do without making the screening function too obvious. Nevertheless, despite its many-sided character, it should be able to attain a better identity and a clearer status by articulating its multiple responsibilities for itself, its students, and its community. "

---

[2] McConnell, T. R., A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

The question always arises, of course, as to whether the community college can discharge its many functions well. In the United States there is considerable evidence that it does quite a commendable job in preparing students for transfer - with exceptions and qualification, of course. Our Center recently completed a study of transfer students in ten states and in more than forty four-year institutions to which a sample of over 8,000 students from junior colleges had transferred in 1960, most of them with junior standing. For purposes of making certain comparisons, a group consisting of some 3,400 native students in four-year institutions was also studied. The findings and conclusions are reported in a publication From Junior to Senior College, available through the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C. Perhaps we can discuss some of the findings at this Conference. In general, they indicated that the junior colleges are fulfilling their role in preparing students to pursue a baccalaureate degree.

In some ways the community colleges in the United States have been less successful in providing occupational training. Perhaps I should say that some of these colleges have been less willing to concentrate on this phase of the program. There are problems in implementing occupational programs, but considerable progress has been made. In all, a new impetus is under way as far as service to the non-transfer student is concerned. A new order of thinking will have to pervade all higher education if this phase of the program is to have respectability.

In this paper I have omitted any discussion of the staffing, organization, and financial support of community colleges. These are important matters and we can discuss them later if you wish. However, they are the facilitating aspects of the subject and have little to do with the basic premise behind the community college.

Naturally, no institution can be transplanted exactly as it is from one country to another, yet the demands for higher education and the nature of the society which it must serve are very much the same in all the highly developed nations. Thus it is that the development of mid-level institutions such as the community college which is occurring in various countries may be studied, not so much as to the form that these institutions take, but more with regard to the forces that are behind them and the expectations that are placed upon them.

Panel Discussion of Dr. Medsker's Paper

Dr. B. E. Wales: Panel Chairman

It is our job from now on this morning to put this Conference into a Canadian setting and Dr. Medsker was invited here because he has been active in the developments which have taken place in the United States, but more particularly because he has knowledge of what is going on in other parts of the world. He has said just exactly what I hoped he would say. It is an amazing achievement for a Conference when the key-note speaker sets forth the issues with such clarity. Recently there has been much concern about the changes that must take place in education after high school. Of course, there is as yet no pattern, and I think the reference to Mr. McConnell's statement that the ambiguity in the role of the colleges is an inherent characteristic may be significant in respect to our thinking. We must look at the ambiguity of the role and not try to set a Canadian community college pattern to be the same all across the country. If we did that there is no doubt that we would simply not have a community college. Dr. Medsker's remark about the wide range of opinion concerning community colleges ties right in with the first comment I want to make as background for our panel discussion. I happened to read recently in an article on Adult Leadership, a publication of the Adult Education Association of the United States, reference to some remarks of the late President John F. Kennedy in which he said "We enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought." Now I hope this Conference will be a very "discomfortable" one as far as you are concerned. I hope that there is a great deal of thought. Last year we had a conference on community colleges and I know that there was much discomfort. That was good . unless there is some discomfort in the minds of some of us as a result of our deliberations, we are probably not giving them the appropriate thought. That Kennedy quotation had a little bit more to it -- he said also "that the great enemy of truth is very often not the lie - deliberate, contrived and dishonest - but the myth - persistent, persuasive and unrealistic". And I think we have, in the next two or three days, to look at what we call higher education, post-secondary education, in Canada and see if there are not some myths about it, see if we are not rationalizing - believing that things cannot be done just because we do not want them to be done.

Dr. Medsker commented on the social forces and I have a panel with me this morning, all of whom are very active in education in Canada, to go on with this topic. I do not propose to take up the time. I want you to hear these gentlemen. I am going to introduce them very briefly and ask them to make a statement. I know it will be a thoughtful statement and in some cases perhaps an informational one. I trust they will be provocative without being provoking. Each will be asked to speak for just a few minutes then, if there is time, they will question each other and receive questions from the floor. In any case you will have the afternoon to discuss in your groups the situation in terms of the philosophy and concept of education after high school. Then the panel will be on deck again for an hour subject to any questions that you would like to aim at any of the members - except the Chairman. Now the program is before you. After an early morning Conference we decided that Dr. Stewart should be the last of the speakers. Dr. Andrew Stewart was the person responsible for a study on junior colleges and you will probably already have a start on him. Mr. Gower Markle is Director of Education for the United Steel Workers of Canada. He is also a member of the board of governors of the Labour College of Canada, which is a recently developed center to promote education in a new way, and one of the leaders and supporters of the Canadian Association for Adult Education.

MR. GOWER MARKLE:

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I think the Chairman has tended to put us under the gun a little with his request that we be provocative and stimulating and all the things we would like to be. As I have watched over the past few months what seems to be happening with respect to the development of these new institutions that we are here to discuss, I was most impressed by the charges and counter-charges, statements and opposing statements and the apparent hardening of the arteries of communication among those we are already established in the field. And I am reminded of the story of the elderly gentleman who went to the doctor and said, "Doctor, I have a very serious problem. I am still chasing women." "Well, I see no problem." "The problem is, doctor, that I have forgotten the reason why." I am wondering if those of us who are involved in the field of education are not perhaps forgetting why we are in the business and what we are trying to do. I think Dr. Medsker perhaps re-oriented us and refreshed our memories this morning. But, as I think about the situation, it seems to me it is not surprising that we find ourselves in this confusion. The formal institution of education is historically the most conservative institution in society (we can spell that with a small 'c'). It has historically, I think, been concerned with looking backward, passing the wisdom of the race and society on to the next generation. The problem that we are facing now is that the wisdom of our generation probably has a large measure of irrelevance to the next generation and we do not know what to pass on. We do not know how to bridge the gap. I am suggesting that we are out of touch with the present younger generation and we do not know how to reach them. It is an indictment of us that there are indications that these people are out of our control and that we now no longer know how to communicate with them and reach them. Perhaps this is one of things that our so-called community colleges, or colleges of applied arts and technology, as we choose to call them in Ontario, may perform. They may bring us into contact with our own children again. I would also like to say that I am pleased to have this opportunity to meet with you this morning. I feel some pride that the labour movement, the organized labour movement, has been in the fore-front of the fight to liberalise education. We fought in the fore-front of the fight to establish free elementary education and free universal secondary education, and we are not going to be satisfied until we have established free universal higher education in all of its implications for whoever has the capacity to take advantage of it, without all the artificial barriers that we up to now have permitted to exist. Again I am pleased to have Dr. Medsker refer to this. I said earlier that perhaps we had forgotten what we are about. I have had the impression that perhaps those of us who are professionally in education have taken the position that the students are there to be 'put through the mill' we have established, rather than taking the position, which I think appropriate, that the institution is there to serve the community and serve the needs of the students. Therefore we may have to make some radical changes. We may have to break down some barriers. We may have, in fact, to blow up some buildings and set-up a whole new establishment and arrangement. If what we have before us, what we have built, what we have invested in, no longer meets the requirements of Canada in the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's, then I am suggesting that perhaps we have to take this kind of dynamic approach to the problem. I suggest, too, that one of the reasons we have this dilemma in Canada is that up to now it has obviously been easier to bend the educational structure and system than it has been to amend the British North American Act. This may be one of the things we have to take a realistic and courageous look at. I have indicated that I feel at present that the community colleges, or these institutions that we are establishing, are in danger of becoming a victim of what I have termed on other occasions - jurisdictional disputes- between those who are already established in the field. And in the labour movement we are no strangers in this situation. I think that one of the cardinal principles that must be established, however, is that the third party involved - the public - has an interest which surmounts and supersedes the individual point of view or the individual interest of any section or any group. This I think is what we have to realize and perhaps submerge some of our own private positions in order to accomplish what is needed in the best interests of the country as a whole. Some of the so-called jurisdictional positions are indicated in such questions as: Are there going to be vocational institutions or are there going to be some academic implications? Is there going to be an element of free transferability from one to the other?

I think that there is danger in such polarization. But I do not think this need be at all. We can surely be reasonable and realize that the institutions have to serve the needs of the people, and if transferability is required, if a relationship between vocational and academic education is indicated, we have to provide facilities and opportunities for these. A second polarization which bothers me is: Are these institutions going to be related to universities or are they going to be related to the secondary school system? I really do not think it matters at all where they are established so long as the relationship is clearly defined, and there is an understanding that the youngsters coming through have a right to placement wherever their best interests lie. Another polarization which I see arising very shortly involves the principle of instruction and the level of instruction. Are the teachers going to be watered-down university professors or are they going to be up-graded high school teachers? Again I think it is a lot of 'bloody' nonsense if I can use a blunt phrase.

University professors need to know how to teach and I think in the past perhaps they have ignored this to some degree. And I think high school teachers have to learn how to deal with adults, which up to now they have not had an opportunity to learn. So here again there is need for a moulding rather than a polarization. The point I am concerned about is that artificial barriers should not stop competent teachers from working and operating in a field where they feel they could make their contribution. Again this brings up the principle of flexibility which seems to me to be the cardinal principle we have to preserve with respect to the functioning of educational institutions in society now. We have to react quickly to the fact of the requirements of the community. I do not know whether I am mixing my metaphors here, but perhaps we need a new breed of cat in education who is perhaps less oriented historically but who looks more to the future and is able to steer close to the wind. He has to be able to react quickly to the immediate changes, to immediate problems and sense the changes required as he goes along. Now how he does this, I do not know. But it seems to me this is one of the requirements.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Mr. Markle. Just one point. I hope we do not have to blow up all the institutions now in existence because we need them. Now ladies and gentlemen and panelists, the next speaker will be the representative from Quebec and he will speak in French. Mgr. Marcel Lauzon is Dean of Arts at Laval University, but more important than that for the purpose of this Conference Mgr. Lauzon is president of the working committee for the institutes which are being established throughout Quebec in implementation of the recent report on education. Now I read with interest what is going on across Canada and I think that the most exciting, the most advanced and most rapidly advancing developments today are taking place in the Province of Quebec. We are going to be interested I know in hearing from Mgr. Lauzon. Later on in answering questions Mgr. Lauzon will accept questions in English.

MGR. MARCEL LAUZON:

I would like to give you a few characteristics of the new institution which is to be set up in the Province of Quebec. The regional college, or community college, is an institution of post-secondary teaching, different from the university in that both the Parent Report and the Ministry of Education want to give the youth of the province an education to meet the needs of our modern technical society. The college will have an open door, but, of course, this does not mean that there will be no standards for the various teaching programs we want to establish. The college will be centred on local needs and on community service. It will offer all the post-secondary programs that young people want, as well as technical and vocational programs. It will be linked to the community by its administrative methods. Even though the Department of Education tries to establish the network and keep contact with secondary and university levels, the college will be in close touch with the community through its administrative board. Our community college will be something like the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario, but will also give courses that will lead to university. It will be comparable to the American Junior College, but only when that institution gives vocational teaching as well as academic, and when that academic teaching is parallel to that given by the universities.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. J. R. G. Davidson is the Research and Training Manager for the Robert Simpson Company. He was a member of the Board of Education in Toronto for, I believe, two years. When we were discussing this Mr. Davidson told me he just had to get out of education if he was going to keep his job. He became so interested and so concerned about the things which must be done and so wanting to get on to doing some of them that he found he was employing his time as a member of the Board of Education rather than as Research and Training Manager for the company which pays his salary. Boards of trustees in Canada are known for the fact that they work as dedicated people and not for the salary in terms of dollars which goes with the job. Mr. Davidson being a young man I presume had to think of the dollars that go with the job as well as the service he could render. So temporarily at least Mr. Davidson is not a trustee but he is here today to share with us his experiences as a citizen from Toronto and as one of the employers in Toronto and to tell us how he sees the business of educational change and community colleges.

MR. J. R. G. DAVIDSON:

Dr. Wales, thank you very much. I sit here in some discomfort as Dr. Wales predicted I would, and this discomfort is I think largely because of my feeling of inadequacy with regard to the collection of very highly skilled academic professionals here. I must say that at the outset I am far from being a professional, but I do represent perhaps the business interest on this panel. I noted Dr. Medsker's remarks about the fact that children these days are conditioned early to University training, and it would be my suggestion that business in its collective sense bears a significant responsibility for providing what is now known as the pressure on higher education. We certainly dangle the carrot incessantly by promising higher rates of remuneration for college graduates. We have provided the incentive through technical advances in business for the need to accumulate more knowledge. For this reason business should bear its full responsibility for creating the need for more and more university facilities or higher education facilities.

It is a truism that businesses themselves are in the educational complex and in the United States I understand that more dollars are spent per year by business in further training its employees than by all the public institutions combined. Now I think that through the services of professionals in colleges and in universities some of this in-service training in business could be put back into the post-high school levels. I feel that the community college can fulfill this need to a very large degree. The employees we have on staff now are constantly encouraged to take further education, further education in all fields. We do not specifically state that we will pay the costs of academic courses or technical courses. We say educate yourself and we will pay for whatever education you require. So in a sense businesses are now supporting university extension courses and technical courses. I think that the significant part of Dr. Medsker's presentation from a business standpoint is the preparation for employment. I think that our universities today have not quite fulfilled the needs of preparing people for employment. There is, perhaps, a certain lack of realism in universities about the needs of business. I think we have before us in the development of the community college the vehicle for providing business with an entré into the field of direct education or the extension of public education to bring the realities of business to the students. I am not condemning universities because they have a very significant function to fulfill, but I would say that the awe in which I sit here at the moment probably represents the awe that business has generally towards higher education. I do not think that there is a very direct or significant communication between the two and I would hope that the development of community colleges through a co-operative sense between business and education will help to 'bridge the gap' between these two bodies.

CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Ross Ford has been responsible over the past many years for the direction given to the programs developed under the federal department of labour and its training branch in respect of technical and vocational education all across Canada. In looking up matters I might have to ask embarrassing questions about, I came across a great amount of material on this topic written in the early 1960's. At that time the federal department of labour and the economics branch and its training division, Dr. Ford, the deputy minister and other persons in Ottawa, were making a great many statements about the fact that something had to be done in respect to the development of better skills among our working force. We did embark on what originally set out to be an emergency training program. Because of its success and the demand, it has been continued and has developed into a complex series of programs. Dr. Ford will now put forth his point of view.

DR. ROSS FORD:

In a recent talk that I gave somewhere I said that I felt the community college was going to be the next important development in our educational services in Canada. I do not know whether it always needs to bear that title, but the kind of service that I envisage will be provided by the institution. This institution is the important new development. As you may suspect, we are concerned about the development of the capabilities and aptitudes of the total population. Now we are just as much concerned about those who are going to go on to the institutions of higher learning which are popularly identified as the universities as we are for any other groups. And we certainly hope that as many of our alpha-plus students in the population as possible are directed to these institutions - as many as we can possibly find and more than we have ever found to-date. But to-date and for several dates in the future, this will not be more than 20 percent of our total Canadian population. As a matter of fact we have not begun to approach this percentage. So that leaves 80 percent of our population that must be serviced by some other form of advanced education. We need a further education, or higher education, of a kind that will enable this 80 percent of our population to integrate into our work-a-day world and the society of today in such a way that they can make their contribution to that society and world. Now for many of these people there is the requirement for advanced training, and my definition of training is not as narrow as it might sound. The need of this group is as great as is that of the group that goes on to university. They are all members of our society and we need them all in production - if you want to speak of economics. We want to use them in the most advantageous way for themselves and for our society. Consequently I am looking to the community colleges to make a contribution to these people to enable them to adjust to the requirements of our changing society.

There were a couple of remarks made by Dr. Medsker this morning that I thought were tremendously important. One was when he said that "it wasn't that we needed more of the same thing but we needed a greater and broader base, we needed a greater variety of offerings in an institution, and that this is the kind of thing we are looking to the community college to provide". He also said "that the community colleges in the United States were less successful in preparing for employment than they were for transfer because this was more difficult". Now he is the first educator I have heard say that preparing for employment was more difficult than preparing for transfer to university. However the statement is true. They have been less successful, or so I have been led to understand. A year or so ago I attended a conference at Norbury, Connecticut in which the state directors of vocational education were present. Repeatedly we heard these directors say that in comprehensive institutions there was an attrition rate of the technical and vocational courses which was constant at somewhere around 5 percent per annum. Why? Because of the direction given to the program in the institutions.

A great variety of services are needed in our educational hierarchy for the 80 percent that I spoke of. Some of them are technological, some are technical, some of them are occupational. The needs are just as urgent as are those for the transfer courses. The programs required by this 80 percent are infinite in number and are just as important, just as identifiable, as the academic courses.

The thing that happens frequently in a comprehensive institution is that a service is provided and it is intended to be all things to all people. This just cannot happen. Particularly is this true when the next step of the person engaged in the program is in to the work-a-day world. He expects us to provide something for him which is identifiable and negotiable in employment. The different programs in an institution - and I can see no conflict between the different objectives which may be identified - must each have its own integrity. I do not think that there is any statement about the diversity of programs in the administration of these institutions more important than that one.

Another statement made this morning rather impressed me. It was that these institutions are designed to meet the needs of students, and that these needs must be identified by the group to be served and not determined by the needs of the people serving them. Educational institutions must be organized in the interests of those receiving the training not of those providing it. This is not always the case. Standards are a matter of considerable importance, but there are a big variety of standards and this is what I meant by the integrity of the individual program. Educational institutions of this kind must beware of doing one thing, providing one kind of service and selling it as something else. And this is a danger which creeps into the comprehensive institution. I can see no difficulty in these institutions providing transfer courses to university in as great a variety as is needed. I can see no difficulty also in the same institution providing programs at the technological level, or at an occupational level, provided the objectives of the programs are identified and the integrity is maintained.

CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Andrew Stewart was first and now he is going to be last. He is bringing to us his experiences as a person who at one time was president of the University of Alberta and who is now perhaps known best to you as Chairman of the Board of Broadcast Governors, a man who has a very important responsibility in respect to educational leadership in public services in Canada.

DR. ANDREW STEWART

I am very grateful as I am sure you all are to Dr. Medsker for coming here and opening up this topic in the way in which he has done it. I entirely agree with his proposition that it is impossible for us to devise or conceive the appropriate forms unless we are conscious of the underlying forces with which education in its broadest sense will be confronted in the years ahead of us. And Dr. Medsker has outlined some of these forces for us. Now there are distant forces and there are the more proximate forces and I would like to pull together some thoughts on the proximate forces which are, as I see it, impelling us forward in certain directions. Education in the past has been largely conceived of as a sort of social gestation period in which we take the young and place them in an institutional environment so that at the completion of a period of time they will be prepared for living. Now one of the changes which is obviously occurring is that, right across the board, this gestation period is being lengthened. This, I think, is attributable to two factors: one, increasing affluence. As we become able to provide the opportunities for longer preparation for the young, we, in fact, do this and so affluence contributes along with the sense of the necessity or need, both in terms of the individual and society, to the longer period of preparation. This is undoubtedly going to continue as the affluent society becomes more affluent. Reducing this to the essential point of concern to us in this discussion: what this is leading to is the completion of the school program by a vastly increased proportion of our young people. I was amazed to find in the Province of Alberta that the grade 12 class is 71 percent of the admissions group in grade 1, twelve years previously. It is not as high as that in many provinces and this may be affected by immigration into the province. But this is happening everywhere. A larger number of people are completing the programs of the schools who will not enter universities. This, in spite of the kind of modifications which I agree with Dr. Medsker the universities may have to make in terms of the things that they do. So this pressure to extend the period of time confronts us with a large group to be served. In time the largest group will proceed from school into some kind of institutional complex which is not the university. And I am inclined to agree with Dr. Medsker that in time this may become the dominant feature of our total educational structure. Now that is the first proximate trend which is pressing on us.

The other one, and I am surprised that so little has been said about it so far, is the change in our approach and our thinking which is required by the changing circumstances in society. The village concept of the world today and of people living in the world village on the one hand, and the increasing rapidity of technological change, both require that we drop this notion of education being only concerned with some kind of period of preparation for living. Of course it must go on continuously throughout life.

Now Dr. Medsker has said that in this area of continuing education, of continuous learning, of repeated rejuvenation of the individual in terms of his capacity to live effectively in society, the community college is admirably suited to this particular function. And I agree with this too, and in our observation of the community college and in our thinking about it, it seems to me that, in this discussion up to now and perhaps generally, we have failed to put sufficient emphasis on this particular function. I think that part of our problem is that we start talking about colleges and as soon as we talk about colleges we think of congeries of buildings, of the place in which instruction is given. This concept may be totally inappropriate to this second, and I suggest equally important function, the function of extending for a year or two the education of young people. What we really should be thinking of is not college at all in this sense, but of decision-making with respect to certain functions. It may be in some situations that a great, elaborate stone-walled institution is the kind of thing you want to have. You may want to have four or five of them in a particular jurisdiction. But basically what we are talking about is not structures of this kind but of people whose responsibility it is to carry forward these particular functions. I think it is much more important for us to think about the kind of people we are going to put on boards of governors of colleges, than to start talking about facilities, and even curriculum and teaching matters, because this is the real key to the thing.

Now quite obviously we have decided that the geographical area of responsibility is larger than the school unit except, perhaps, in the cities. And it is smaller than the territorial concern of universities which draw their students, and I think should continue to draw their students, from all parts of a province, from all parts of other provinces and from all parts of the world. But we have said that these institutions will be district or regional institutions, close enough to the people that they are going to serve to be in constant touch with their needs and yet large enough to be able to function effectively. And so the college is primarily a jurisdiction, a group of people who are going to be given the responsibility for pursuing these functions in a particular area, in terms of the needs of the people as they vary. And I agree entirely with what Dr. Ford has said. Surely this phenomenon confronts us today: when you are dealing with young adults who have left school, and with older adults in the continuing education process, they are going to demand - and the process will not be effective unless their demands are met - a large measure of participation in the planning of the services which are made available to them, in the administration of the services which are made available to them, and in the decisions with respect to the kind of techniques which you are going to apply in this area.

May I close by asking one question of Dr. Medsker and it deals with the matter which Dr. Ford has touched upon when he talked about the integrity of courses in a comprehensive institution. I had the privilege of reading Dr. Medsker's paper beforehand, and I will read a quote from it first, then the question which I want to ask:

> "Administrators, counsellors and teachers in most of the two-year colleges visited agreed that no matter how hard an institution endeavours to effect a terminal occupational program, it is difficult to enter students in the program except in highly specialized institutions, not comprehensive institutions. One reason for this difficulty is the prestige values that pertain to regular college work."

And I was appalled when I went to the Province of Alberta to look at the development of junior colleges there to see the shocking consequences of sheer prestige in terms of the distortion of the activities of these institutions, if indeed they are designed to pursue the two functions which you have allotted. Now the question ... in the process of democratizing education do we get rid of sheer intellectual snobbery?

DR. MEDSKER:

The question is a good one obviously and is one to which there is no one answer. It is one to which I, as well as everyone else, have given a lot of thought over the years and I have some feeling that, like most other social developments, these are matters that have to evolve. We have been experiencing what, I suppose, has been a cultural lag as far as higher education is concerned. For a long time higher education was higher education - the great emphasis on the academic. But now we face new situations: the fact that vocational education is being extended upwards, and the fact, too, that we have institutions like the community college. I suspect we are in the first stage of a realignment, of the formation of a new attitude towards this type of training, and I hope working towards integrity for it. But these changes do not really come overnight. I think we are beginning to see, down our way, a change in attitude despite the fact that we are by no means over the hump. As a matter of fact some of us are very worried about the fact that increasingly the junior college or community college is being looked upon as, quote, "higher education" and, therefore, administrators and faculty members may now say that since the college is part of higher education we ought to begin acting like a university. There is this danger, but I still think that over the long run, with the emphasis that is being given to training beyond high school and with increased monies available for it, we are beginning to realize at last that the community college is the most appropriate place for this type of education.

COLLEGES OF APPLIED ARTS AND TECHNOLOGY IN ONTARIO

THE HONOURABLE MR. WILLIAM DAVIS: Minister of Education, Province of Ontario.

It is really quite encouraging to those of us who have some responsibility in the field of education to find the great interest that is formulating amongst the public as far as post-secondary experience is concerned. It is only a year ago that the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario became a legislative reality. They had been discussed in one form or another for perhaps two or three years, but it was really just a year ago this coming month that the legislative framework was passed by Parliament. Since that time the Council of Regents for the colleges has been appointed and has made some very substantial progress in developing plans for these new institutions. In March of this year I was able to announce the formation of 18 college areas throughout the Province. For the benefit of those from outside Ontario it may be well to outline what was done. The Council of Regents adopted the ten economic, or perhaps development, regions created by the Department of Economics and Development of this Province and took these ten regions as the basis for the establishment of the college areas. It was obvious that some of the economic regions would support more than one of these institutions. The Central Ontario economic region, for instance, will have, we estimate, five of these colleges because this region includes the Metropolitan Toronto area and perhaps 30% of the population of the Province. There are some of the Council here, and Mr. Sisco will be ready to answer questions on the panel which is to follow. But I think one can say that the criteria used were the student population, the geographic nature of the region, to a degree the economic resources and, just as importantly, the educational function that the college would serve - not just for a community, but for a region as a whole.

The next step of course was the appointment of Boards of Governors and these have already been named for some four of the college areas. We anticipate that four more Boards of Governors will be appointed within the next few days. I should point out to you that under the legislation these Boards have really very wide powers. They actually have the power to move in to develop, and construct the college facilities themselves so that, in a very real sense, they have the power to run the particular institution.

During the past developmental year, as we describe it here, our plans have firmed to a very substantial degree and we think they have crystallized into a new and exciting concept. This is due, I believe, to the particular circumstances surrounding the establishment of these colleges within our Province. We have admittedly learned a good deal from our neighbours to the south, from other provinces of Canada as well as many of the countries of Western Europe. However, few of these share our fundamental purpose, and fewer still are true "community colleges" as we construe the term in Ontario. This is a very interesting term that has grown up south of the border, but we question whether it really is a proper one to be used here as we understand the institution in our Province. Our colleges, and I emphasize this, are in no way meant to be junior universities. They are rather institutions of continuing education at the post-secondary school level for those students who are not able or who do not wish to pursue work of the traditional university type. The concept is to provide a total comprehensive program, variable as to length of course, and completely flexible in providing the needs of the young person graduating from the school system and the adult who is seeking further education and training for vocational or avocational reasons.

I should emphasize at this point, in trying to relate our development here to the other provinces in Canada, that we have embarked in Ontario, I think this is a fair statement, on a more comprehensive technical and vocational program in our secondary schools than have perhaps our sister provinces across Canada. At the latest count, something close to 50% of our secondary school population was in what we describe as the business, commercial, technical, or vocational streams within the secondary school program. This should be made clear so that those of you from provinces where the secondary program is, perhaps, still primarily academic can understand what we are doing with our so-called community college program. You must understand that close to 50% of the youngsters within our secondary system are already having exposure to the technical, vocational, commercial or business facets of education. This must be taken into consideration when you are attempting to assess the development of our college situation within the Province of Ontario.

But I want to emphasize that in the legislation that was drafted we have not overlooked the possible need for university programs in some areas of the Province and the amendment to the Education Act includes the following clause which I think is unique on this Continent. At least it certainly does not exist in many of the jurisdictions we have studied south of the border. This part of the legislation says specifically: "Subject to the approval of the Minister, a Board of Governors of the college may enter into an agreement with the University for the establishment, maintenance and conduct by the University in the college of programs of instruction leading to degrees, certificates, or diplomas awarded by the University." This makes it very clear that if a transfer or parallel course program is built into one of the colleges in a certain geographic region this will be done in affiliation with an existing Ontario university.

Some of you may ask why this is necessary. I think if you look at some of the difficulties they are experiencing in the neighbouring jurisdictions to the south you will have the answers. A substantial number of students in the so-called junior college program, perhaps have the qualifications for transfer to the third year of a regular university program, but there is no formal or recognized manner of doing so in some jurisdictions. We hope we have guarded against that here in Ontario by having the programs actually in affiliation with an existing Ontario university. We thereby ensure that the quality of the program will be exactly the same as given in the parent institution and, of course, we feel this will enable the students to be recognized not only by the affiliating institution but by the other Ontario universities as well. But I want to emphasize that this is being built in. It will have immediate application in perhaps one or two regions of the Province.

As I go further in my remarks I will explain that we have not embarked on a large parallel course program within the colleges because of other plans existing here in our Province. But I want to make one thing abundantly clear. If these colleges are properly to fulfil their community function, if they are to operate in a unique role, and if, indeed, they are to achieve the status of which they are worthy they must establish themselves not on a reputation as university extensions but on their own function. The image must be one of a college that is supplying a well established need, both academic and vocational within the Province.

That such a need exists there can be no question. As early as 1964, the Report of the Grade 13 Study Committee summarized it in the following manner: "The truth of the matter is that we are now in an entirely different world from that in the 1920's and 1930's, and it is necessary that we extend our educational system to meet the demands of this new world. In the past when we have faced this sort of crisis, we have solved the problem by expanding the secondary school program - in 1871, for example, when we added general education for the many to special education for the few, or the 1920's when technical training was introduced in a considerable number of high schools. In the present crisis, the need cannot be met simply by alterations or additions at secondary school level, this time we must turn our attention to the post-secondary level, where we must create a new kind of institution that will provide in the interests of students for whom a university course is unsuitable, a type of training which universities are not designed to offer. Fortunately, a beginning has been made in the establishment of institutes of technology and vocational centres, but as yet they are too few in number and their offerings are too narrow in range to satisfy what is required both by the nature of our developing economy and the talents of our young people. The committee is therefore recommending the establishment of community colleges to provide these new and alternative programs."

It is the factors peculiar to our Province that account for the differences between our concept of the "community college" and that which has informed the colleges within the large part of the United States and in other provinces in Canada.

I would like Mr. Chairman, just for a moment, to look at some of these factors in some detail. Firstly, unlike some of our sister provinces, Ontario is now almost totally industrialized. Fewer than 8% of our population is engaged in agriculture or in occupations associated with agriculture, thus there is arising in our own Province, to a degree felt nowhere else in Canada, an overwhelming demand for vocational training and re-training at all levels. This demand is the result of the rapid advances of science and technology in an area in which the so-called population explosion has made the situation exceedingly acute, if not down-right dangerous. The problem must be solved if we are to maintain our present rate of productivity or more desirably to increase this rate. But the problem goes deeper than this. As the Economic Council of Canada, under the chairmanship of Dr. John Deutsch has repeatedly pointed out, we must take every possible means of expanding our economic growth if we are to provide employment for our increasing population and if we are to maintain qur position in the field of international trade. "Our concern relates to the role of education in the growth of the national economy," says Dr. Deutsch. "The economic importance of education has already been stressed in our First Annual Review, especially in our discussion of the vital need for creating and maintaining an adequate supply of professional, technical, managerial and other highly skilled manpower as a basis for future growth of the Canadian economy. We also placed increased investment in human resources to improve knowledge and skills at the head of our list of essential ingredients for attaining the goal of faster and better sustained productivity growth.". In this statement Dr. Deutsch, as I told him not so many weeks ago, successfully placed most of the problems facing the developing economy of this Province and this country at the doorstep of education. I said this imposed quite a large load on educators and that we would do our best to resnond. But I think it is very encouraging for those of you who are devoting your time and effort to education to realize that there is a very direct relationship between what we are attempting to do within the field of education and the economic, and just as importantly, the social development of this Province and of course of this nation.

Now another factor which I am sure is hard for our sister provinces to understand, since it is peculiar to Ontario, is our grade 13 year. This is looked upon in our secondary school system as a year devoted to university entrance. It is essentially, however, in many respects the first year of university study. When the grade 13 year was introduced back in 1853, it permitted admittance to the second year of what was then the second year of a four-year B.A. degree course at the University of Toronto. A very venerable qualification indeed! And its venerability indicates that up to the present, at least, there has been no immediate need for the introduction of the early university years into the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. In fact it can be shown statistically that, with present plans for university expansion, there will be no shortage of places in the Ontario universities for some time to come. It was rather interesting, Mr. Chairman, that this past academic year we had actually a slight surplus of student places at universities developing here in this Province. We have some 15 or 16 provincially-assisted universities, and some four or five relatively new institutions in the process of development and growth. These new universities, we feel, will perhaps make it unnecessary, for a period of time at least, to offer the so-called parallel program in some parts of this Province. The present planning for university development will enable about 20% of the age group 19 - 24, 25 to find a place in an Ontario university by roughly 1970-71. At the present moment, if one can use these figures with any accuracy, roughly 12.4% to 12.6% of the age group 18, 19 to 24, 25 are enrolled in Ontario universities. At the same time if one is attempting to compare the population of this age group with other jurisdictions, particulary in the United States, one should also keep in mind that you have this year close to 30,000 grade 13 students in the high schools of this Province who are in the same age level, or in the same range as far as scholastic experience is concerned, as the students in the first year at many American junior colleges or even in the university programs. To this percentage you add, of course, the students who are enrolled in our institutes of technology, our vocational centres and our teachers' colleges. Actually in Ontario, leaving out the grade 13 students, close to 18-19% of the age group are enrolled in post-secondary institutions. But it is our hope, and it is the plan of the universities and the government, to provide sufficient pupil places that we can accommodate this 20% in the universities themselves by roughly 1970-71.

But even if this is achieved, Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite obvious that there will be a substantial percentage of young people, not only in our Province but I would suggest in the other provinces across Canada, who will need some further type of post-secondary experience and this is really the concept that has been developed here in Ontario. It is an acknowledgment really that, as our society develops, as technology increases, it is becoming increasingly obvious that a much higher percentage of young people and adults will need this type, or some type, of post-secondary experience if they are to move into the world of business, industry and commerce. I am not sure what Dr. Medsker indicated when he spoke to you yesterday, but I know that in our own visits and studies in the State of California, discussing primarily with the industrial leaders and the personnel officers the thing we found very intriguing was that business and industry in that State today are requiring of a high percentage of their employees a minimum of the two-year junior or community program. I do not say we have reached this position in the Province of Ontario, but I think it is quite obvious that we should be making our plans so that we are in a position to accommodate the increasing demands for education by the post-secondary student and adult population as well.

Another factor that should be pointed out, as far as the development in our Province is concerned, is the unparalleled growth of the provincial institutes of technology, and of the trades institutes and vocational centres. And I think that this should be mentioned as further substantiation of our claim that the new colleges will fill a great need. These institutes have been forced out of their original pattern into hybrid organizations offering a wide choice of courses and they are now, in many respects, fledgling colleges of applied arts and technology themselves.

We like to believe that our actions, in response to these unique circumstances, have been as positive as the philosophy which informs them and that they are resulting in a system of colleges, whose aim is to educate in the full sense of the word rather than merely to "train". We are convinced that unless education is firmly grounded in cultural as well as vocational subjects, not only the student, but also industry is being sadly short-changed. To concentrate, at any level, on manual expertise, to the detriment of the thinking process, is a retrograde action that commits us to nothing more than a redundant retraining program which is surely not in keeping with the college concept. Our planning for the colleges, therefore, has taken cognizance of both our academic and vocational needs.

It would be difficult, and I want to make this very clear, to predict exactly what our colleges will be like five or ten years hence. It is our sincere hope that they will grow and that they will be flexible institutions that will develop along with our needs. But, if one could generalize, we would foresee our colleges functioning in four main areas and organized around four key centres.

Firstly, a technological centre which will continue to offer three year courses in engineering technology in the major branches of engineering and in industrial management with a limited number of three year courses to be added as the need arises.

Secondly, a technical and skilled trades centre which will fulfil the dual function of providing an increasing number of two-year technician level courses as well as providing the "sandwich" courses, as we describe them here, for the Department of Labour apprentices. It should perhaps be mentioned in passing that the demand for technician training based on a two-year course subsequent to grade 12 graduation is the most rapidly expanding area in our post-secondary system today. We are working constantly with industrial and professional groups in developing new courses across an ever-broadening field.

Thirdly, a business centre which will absorb the three-year course in business administration now given at the institute of technology and the one-year courses now offered at the vocational centres. To this will be added an increased number of two-year courses in such fields as computer programming, institutional management for the hotel, restaurant and tourist industry, and marketing and sales - and you could go on almost indefinitely.

Fourthly, a general and applied arts centre which would also play a dual role. This centre will supply much of the cultural enrichment and the related academic subjects for the other three centres. It will also offer courses of a general educational nature which will be a combination of liberal studies and related occupational subjects. Such courses as journalism, social case work, child care and public recreation will fall within this general area. It is anticipated that these courses will have a special appeal for the four-year graduate who is not technically inclined.

To describe these formal aspects of the college program is to seriously reduce the total concept, for unless these new institutions can direct their teaching staff and facilities to the needs of the total population, they will have fallen far short of the planned goal. We anticipate that most of the so-called "bread and butter" programs will be available to both day and evening classes so that employed people may readily profit from the courses offered. In addition, we plan that these colleges, which have been based on the economic development regions of Ontario as I stated, will play a significant role in the provision of courses for the up-grading and up-dating of the adult population. They must also play a significant role in the provision of all types of courses which may appeal to the interests of a population with an increasing amount of leisure time.

I have studied with great interest the White Paper on the Education of Adults in Canada, a paper published after two years of investigation by the Canadian Association for Adult Education. I would suggest, ladies and gentlemen, that the objectives spelled out in that paper, and certainly the section of it that deals with community colleges, will be attained by the concept of a community college which I have outlined to you in very general fashion today. I feel that our present plans, and, perhaps more importantly, the philosophy on which these plans are based, measure up to the paper's suggestions. This is apparent in the adult education function as I have defined it. If the college courses, especially on the senior levels are to be made available to "all adults within the community, at all socio-economic levels, of all kinds of interests and aptitudes, and at all stages of educational development," a large part of this function will be up-grading, to meet the needs of further study, an activity at present pretty much confined to the Canadian Vocational Training Programs 4, 5 and 6. What the CAAE is looking for, I often feel, is what we are all looking for: an integrated system of education that, beginning with grade 1, perhaps beginning with kindergarten, will carry our children through to university, or to the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and on, not only into adulthood, but also through adulthood, so that at every moment, from birth to death, they may live as creatively as they are potentially able. I think indeed, Mr. Chairman, that it is time we threw the term "adult" out of education and regarded the whole process as a continuing situation.

For this reason the Branch of my Department which is acting as the administrative arm for the Council of Regents for the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, as well as operating most of the adult programs offered under the terms of the Technical and Vocational Training Agreement, is about to undergo a change of title. To better indicate the comprehensiveness of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario and to better emphasize their communal nature and to include in the concept the many areas now served by the Technological and Trades Training Branch, it has been decided that the Branch will be substantially enlarged and will henceforth be known as the Applied Arts and Technology Branch - a synonym for the continuing education that I have been outlining here and a project, on the need of which, we are, I think, completely agreed.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sisco and others are here from the Department to indicate to our sister provinces what we are attempting here in Ontario. I think I should emphasize that while it is very difficult with the existing traditions and practises in the many provinces of Canada to develop concepts that have specific application to each individual province, I think I can say on behalf of the Ministers of Education that we are interested in making sure that our sister provinces are fully informed, that they understand what they are doing so that we can relate - certainly in a philosophical sense - the developments of education which are taking place right across Canada. For our friends here from Quebec, it was just a year and a half ago that members from their own department of education and officials from the Ontario department of education joined in what was the first joint safari to the southern states to study the junior college program within those particular jurisdictions. Because of certain traditions, such as grade 13 in Ontario, our plans for the development of colleges or universities perhaps cannot run parallel with all other provinces. But I would like to say to the delegates from right across Canada that as educators you must and should be interested in seeing what degree of uniformity, certainly as far as the concept is concerned, can in fact be achieved, so that people who are moving from one jurisdiction to another will not be prejudiced because of the move. I also point out that there are some very practical problems involved. I think it is most encouraging, and your own Association, Mr. Chairman, has had much to do with bringing this about, that we now see some national thinking as far as education is concerned. I become enthused about these colleges when I am discussing them and it has been a pleasure to be with you and to outline to you some of the plans we are developing here in the Province of Ontario, with the sincere hope that these will be of some benefit to our sister provinces across Canada.

Planning: Administration and Curriculum Development

Panel Discussion: Mr. Gordon Campbell, Panel Chairman.

The task of our panel today is to review from coast to coast the developments in Community College administration, philosophy, organization, planning, the role of faculty, the role of students and a great number of issues which have been touched upon in our proceedings up to now and will be dealt with in greater detail tomorrow. Our approach will be to start with the concerns of the student: the initial statement, perhaps the only speech which will be made by our panelists, will be by Mr. Malcolm Fisher, who is a student in the Vancouver City College. He was born in North West Ontario and for the past four years has been involved in the development of social welfare in British Columbia. Mr. Fisher started last fall at Vancouver City College. He has been asked to make a statement viewing the operation of the College, as he sees it, in respect of the curriculum, faculty, administration, philosophy and what it meant to him in terms of where he wanted it to go.

Mr. Norman Sisco is Director of Technological and Trades Training Branch of the Department of Education in Ontario. He is a graduate in History from the University of Toronto, at one time he was a secondary school teachers, principal, district inspector and superintendent in the Department of Education, and he has been director of this Branch since 1965. Mr. Claude Beauregard has been for twelve years - 1950 to 1962 - in the Royal Canadian Navy and for two years, 1962 to 1964, he was Registrar of Brébeuf College. Since 1964 he has been Deputy Secretary-General of the Federation of Classical Colleges in the Province of Quebec.

Dr. Bert Wales who you have already met, is Director of the Vancouver City College and President of the Canadian Association for Adult Education and a person with vast experience and competence in the field of education in British Columbia. Dr. R. E. Rees was born and educated in Alberta and has been a school teacher, principal and superintendent of schools, professor of education in Saskatoon, and latterly in Edmonton, Director of Special Educational Services for the Department of Education and, with effect today, Dr. Rees has been appointed Chief Superintendent of Schools.

Now we have some ground rules. We have decided not to make, or attempt to make, any definitive statements about the points we are going to discuss. I am going to ask Mr. Fisher to make our only speech. For five or six minutes he will comment on the situation as he sees it and we have asked him to be candid and straight forward and call the shots as he sees them. Then the rest of us are going to comment. From a student point of view, on the administration and operation of the Community Colleges across Canada, Mr. Fisher.

MR. MALCOLM FISHER:

Ladies and gentlemen, last year I had not finished high school, this year I have what is commonly referred to as 'first year University', next year I shall enter the professional development program at Simon Fraser - one of Canada's "instant universities". Could this have happened ten years ago, or even five years ago? I think not. Could it have happened outside of beautiful British Columbia? Perhaps, I do not know. But this much I do know: it did happen and is happening in that evergreen playground just over the mountains next to the blue Pacific along with the affluent society that seems prepared to challenge any other province for first place in the Dominion.

Now that I have taken care of my responsibility as a civil servant I will get on to the bigger task of being a student. What I am going to do actually is to try and give you my impressions of the various incidents which seem to make up the average day, week, month, semester of a student in - well let's call it in our particular case - a community college. Because they are only impressions, some of my remarks may appear to be perhaps a bit disjointed and unrelated, but they are very real. Although I am not suggesting that everyone should go out on a limb as I did, I do want to impress upon you the real strengths which I have benefited from as well as some of the weaknesses I have had to suffer under.

Let me first tell you why I left school originally 20 years ago. As I look back on it the only real reason I can find is that the principal suggested I leave. It was a 'bitter pill to swallow'. Actually, I have had it in my throat for 20 years. I am quite sure the man hated farmers and I was a farmer's son. It was easier to teach the kids from the city. Since school was a bit of a financial hardship on my parents, they were not too hard to convince either. As a result, on completion of grade 10 I was withdrawn from high school. It was the only bit of counselling I had ever received during my years at high school and I would sincerely hope that the situation has changed. If it hasn't then I would like to suggest that perhaps someone should pull their trousers up and, in this case, I do not think it is the student.

Now why do people make the effort to get more education? What motivates them? And how do you go about getting it? My first effort, and again I will not bore you with details of years, was correspondence courses. These were a complete flop because of the lack of supervision, and a lack of ability on my part to work with this cold, rather impersonal writing back and forth to someone you have not seen and someone who has not seen you. The next was night school classes at a high school. This program has been in operation, of course, in many of the provinces for a good number of years. I do not know whether it was my age particularly, perhaps it was my size, which gave me a feeling of discomfort in a high school system. Quite frankly I felt I was out of place. I still had in the back of my mind an awareness of the need for more education. When I went to British Columbia it was as chief supervisor of Willingham school, which is a provincial training school for girls. It was a good position and one from which I resigned on the day I left for Toronto.

On many occasions I sat a little uneasily in the chair I occupied as the assistant to the superintendent. Professor Dixon, who is the Director of the School of Social Work at U.B.C., suggested that perhaps I was a person who showed some promise and should endeavour to get into their program, and enter the School of Social Work as an under-graduate. So this was the original reason for getting back to university.

With this in mind I approached Vancouver City College and there with the help of counsellors was able to select a program that I felt I could cope with and one in which credits would be transferable. It is difficult to convey to you my feelings in getting back as a student. But I would like to make this clear: it was the instructors who lifted me up, got rid of this 'pill' that I had carried around for 20 years and made me feel that it was not an unreal goal that I was seeking. I did, as the Chairman mentioned earlier, night classes in the fall semester; I obtained four months educational leave of absence in January and took a full semester doing six courses. Mind you I was not a first class honours student, but I did make second class honours. I am now back at work and will be leaving at the end of August to go into Simon Fraser.

Let me first of all mention instructors. They are good and bad. I ran into both and I think any institution has both and perhaps will continue to have them. I noticed yesterday that two or three of the people who spoke referred to students as children. I am not a child. I do not like being referred to as a child. You, too, are a student and perhaps we are all students together. One of the difficult things to overcome within a college system is going to be the idea that you are dealing with children. These are young adults.

In the area of curriculum, stress has been put on technical vocational courses. Had these not been transferable, the college would have been of no value to me as an individual. I do not know how many other students plan to go on to University, but it is nice to know that the courses you can take at a community college are transferable to the university. In Vancouver, they are because they have been cleared through with Simon Fraser.

Let me for just a moment deal with student participation. There is a real need of this and a real area for it within a college, but I think there are other areas where student participation is not desirable. One of these perhaps is determining who shall be on the teaching staff. I do not feel that this is a matter for student concern. Quite frankly I was very glad that someone else was concerned about it for I had enough to do handling six courses without worrying about whether or not the teacher was a satisfactory individual. I used every facility and resource available, right from the men's washroom in the basement, to the growing library in what was called 'the dome'. Never once did I meet up with a brick wall, or a dead end. I encountered a few stumbling stones, but these were perhaps placed there on purpose, to see if I was going to be able to get over them. I think the regular seminars within a college system are particularly important. I did not miss a seminar, quite frankly more than once when I attended there was only the instructor and myself. They are of vast importance and the student who really wants help, guidance, counselling, can find them if he tries.

CHAIRMAN:

May I ask you to make just one more comment. As I heard it, much of what you had to say is sweetness and light, and yet I know you have reservations. Dr. Wales would you permit one of your students to make some rather critical remarks?

The Director says there is no censorship.

MR. FISHER:

Now as a matter of fact I have reached page 12 and I have headed it "weaknesses". I can only speak from my own experience, but I would say that one of them was the lack of good library facilities. I know in our particular case the difficulty was that what had been a high school library had to be built into a college library. As a result, I and other students like myself - I think in 2½ months I turned in nine research papers - had to use facilities outside of the college. Often these were at quite a distance, and trying to juggle these trips between classes and writing papers was not an easy job.

The other is this business of some instructors who insisted on keeping a vast distance between desk and desk - and these being the desks of the student and the instructor. I do not know how they expect the student to participate or really give all that he may have to give if he is always held at this great distance. I was not involved in this, but it used to bother me to see the instructors coming around picking up decks of playing cards from students who during their lunch hour in the cafeteria decided to play - I do not know what game they played - but there was no money involved. What student had any? And yet they confiscated the cards. This is no way to break their card playing habit. I did not have time to play cards and I do not know how many courses these people were taking. But I felt that after all they were young adults and if they wanted to play cards perhaps they should be allowed to play.

One of the other things - and this is no fault of the college particularly - but in order to attend I had to give up a home, or at least make arrangements for someone else to look after it, because I could not live in Burnaby and attend Vancouver City College as a day student. This worked out a bit of a hardship as it ended up with my going into a room in someone else's house, which is a little difficult after being on your own for a number of years. I say a little difficult, it was very difficult.

CHAIRMAN:

Can we first gentlemen, start on the question of student participation in the administration of a college? Mr. Fisher suggested that there were appropriate roles for a student to play in this. Dr. Wales would you like to comment?

DR. WALES:

Certainly I would like to comment. I think the students have a great role in connection with the colleges. There are certain ways in which they can facilitate their development and functioning if they actively organize themselves with this in mind. This business of card playing is a very interesting one. This is the first I have heard of it. If we are going to treat people as adults, we must accept the fact that they are adults and will be responsible for themselves. Through their own organizations students can do a great deal to see that this type of problem of relationship does not exist.

I would like to make a point about Mr. Fisher's remarks on restrictions regarding residence. This happens to be one of the developing factors. What region does the particular centre serve. In our case by legislation it serves Vancouver City. And we would not have this as a major problem. I think that the other points he made were quite good. The college should serve the students, the facilities should be there for them to use. It is up to them to organize themselves to take the best advantage of what is there.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sisco is there any provision in the legislation in Ontario for student participation in the administration of the colleges?

MR. SISCO:

No, there is no provision in the legislation, although since there is not a great deal of centralized power in the legislation, a Council of Regents or a Board of Governors can have complete liberty to take this type of thing into account. The Council of Regents has a committee on student affairs which is studying participation within the college. When you ask what part they should have in the direct administration I certainly feel, as Dr. Wales has expressed, that students must be considered, must be a part of the college. They must be treated as adults, but I think that there is a limited participation.

CHAIRMAN:

Do you feel students should have any participation in the policy-making activities of the college, either by direct representation or by indirect representation?

MR. SISCO:

Well, I certainly think that they must be heard and must have the normal channels for making their views felt. I am, I suppose, traditionally oriented enough to feel that when you are designing or developing a college with an avowed purpose you must consider your students in the light of this avowed purpose. You should not switch from your fundamental base because it does not appeal to somebody.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Mr. Beauregard would you care to comment on the rol of the student in the administration policy of the college?

MR. BEAUREGARD:

This question of considering students as young adults is one of the basic preoccupations in the Province of Quebec right now. Every day there is a fresh communique from the students that reminds us of this. Th Parent Report, which is a report on education in Quebec, has played an important role in giving responsibility to students. I think we are all agreed on this point. To give you some indication of this, the planning committee which organizes the administrative and pedogogical structure of or institutes, or community colleges, wants to adopt direct representation on te part of students on the Board of Governors of the institutions. We also want to have the participation of students on the main committees and councis of the institutions.

Someone mentioned a few minutes ago that the participation of students in the assessment of the role of teachers did not seem appropriat I agree with this. I know that in the United States this takes place. Students assess the value of their teachers and teachers do not accept thi very well.

CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Rees, have you a comment?

DR. REES:

Yes, I would like to have a look at this from a somewhat different angle. This involves the pool of students, the potential group of students who will be at the college. Now in Alberta we have a fair pool of students. In 1941, 25 years ago, we lost from our schools 66%, roughly two-thirds, of the students who had entered eleven years earlier. Today we are losing about 23%. We are holding in our class rooms and entering grade 12, 76.99% of the student population. So we have a considerable pool of people who are going to require services of this sort. The question is how are you going to reach them? We are still going to have a few drop-outs. We are still going to have this problem of developing a program to meet the needs of these people who have dropped out. I think that it is not unlikely that we will have drop-outs in the future.

CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if you want to comment directly on the question of student involvement in the administration of the college?

DR.REES:

Well, this is matter on which I do not have first-hand knowledge. We have other people who are more qualified to speak on that.

DR. BEAUREGARD:

I would like to mention that the Duff-Berdahl Report on University Government in Canada (1) will seem to many students quite conservative, especially to the students of Quebec. So those who are interested in the Province should read this Report as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN:

On now to the problem of curriculum. What role do you think should be played by the student in the development of the curriculum?

MR. SISCO:

Well if you listened to Mr. Davis this morning you will realise that the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario have certainly, in the broad sense of the word, a vocational 'bias'. So that our development of curriculum, certainly as it applies to the hard areas, is not a centre-imposed curriculum, rather a curriculum developed through consultation with the teachers of the subjects and the people of business and industry who are in a sense the ultimate consumers of the product. Our existing curriculum apparatus in the post-secondary field works in this manner. The teachers and supervisors from the Department of Education's point of view sit down with advisory committees representing the various consumers of the product and work out the details of the curriculum. I do not think a student coming to study as an engineering technologist, or in the field of administration, of hotel administration or even in the field of journalism has a great deal to say about what the content of the curriculum should be.

CHAIRMAN:

Anyone to comment?

DR. N. O. BARRETT:

In the field of the curriculum you would have to determine in the first place the preferences of students. In the second place what does industry and business require? Committees of such people are formed and the curriculum is developed on those lines. Now the university program is the same program as is being offered at the university.

---

(1) Report of the Commission on University Government in Canada. University of Toronto Press, 1966. $2.00.

MR. BEAUREGARD:

I think we can give students the possibility of playing an advisory part in the development of school programs. In certain institutions it might be possible to have students on an individual or on a group basis make recommendations or suggestions so that certain courses be adopted.

CHAIRMAN:

Would anyone like to comment on how, in fact, the curriculum has been determined in any of the colleges across Canada? Dr. Wales?

DR. WALES:

I do not think the students have too much direct say in connection with the curriculum, but I think they are a very important group which must be considered. In the first place the curriculum has to depend on the student group you have and on their goals. And you have to keep in mind the fact that you want to get back into these colleges persons who have left the school system and are coming back to up-grade themselves and the fact that we have 38% of our people over 21 and a good percentage over 30. You have to remember the maturity of these people in the way the materials are presented and in the actual content, in some cases, of the curriculum.

Now it has already been said that the technical and business programs are developed through the community and this does not need to be repeated. We have had a very interesting experience with the academic program which I think is quite pertinent to our discussion. In Alberta they teach the University of Alberta program and I gather that the Ontario programs of a strictly academic nature would be given by universities and colleges. In British Columbia our staff have developed academic programs in close co-operation with university people, but they are independent programs in the sense that they are designed for the student group we have. In some cases students are perhaps not primarily intellectual people, perhaps they are more mature. I have been really impressed with the co-operation and the support we have had from the faculty chairmen in the different departments at both universities. One of the strengths of a college, if it can develop an academic program independently of the university, is that you can get in certain variations from the traditional university courses. These will serve your groups better, and will still be good academic programs at the college level. We have acceptance by the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University for a number of courses we are giving which are not offered in either of those institutions. These are designed more directly for our particular group. I think this is an important aspect of the student curriculum making.

CHAIRMAN:

Now let me ask you a direct question on the basis of Mr. Fisher's presentation. Mr. Fisher is 36 years old and for four years he has been in the Department of Social Welfare dealing directly with human problems of a very complicated order and I would have thought in a very sophisticated way. Why shouldn't Mr. Fisher have a direct say in what ought to comprise some aspects of the curriculum in the courses he has elected.

DR. WALES:

I think Mr. Fisher already had an influence in the program through the preparatory course modifications that are being made. Mr. Fisher had I believe a grade 10 and until now you have had to practically go through the regular high school program in British Columbia to get grade 12. And I think this is pretty well common. We've had many objections to the specific content of the course requirements for the college prep. program or the high school equivalency program and now we are making progress with the provincial department in respect to recognizing the fact that there should be a high school program for adults, so I think that there will be, in effect. It is just beginning to come through into beautiful British Columbia.

CHAIRMAN:

Your comment, Mr. Fisher.

MR. FISHER:

Yes, I would like to make one comment here, Mr. Chairman, since Dr. Wales has mentioned the importance of the courses which are transferable to universities. Again emphasizing the importance of good counselling in this area, I might point out again that when I went to Vancouver City College it was with the idea of getting a first year standing or its equivalent. This was in order to get into the School of Social Work. The counsellor made out a program for me which turned out to be acceptable as a first year university level and I will now go into what is called second year. The community college should be an institution of learning in its own right, not a poor cousin of the university, or a sophisticated high school, but rather an institution serving the needs of the particular locality. And this will vary I am sure from say Vancouver to Burnaby or to North Vancouver, or any of the areas within a large centre where you have different types of industry and different needs as far as the community is concerned. After all if the community colleges are going to serve the community then we assume that people are not going to move away from home in order to attend them.

MR. [illegible]:

It seems to me we should be clear that the question of programs is a most complex one. There are at least four agencies involved in their development. Because of the need of credits or transfers, it is important to have support at the government level. The worlds of industry and labour have certain needs which must be respected. We have to think of the wishes of the students and, most important, we must not forget a certain freedom which the teachers will want in order to work within a program. The development of program is a very complex matter and talking only of student intervention is over-simplifying. Actually what is needed is a vast amount of co-ordination.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. I think I should mention that Selkirk College has four types of programs in which student participation varies. There is, first of all, the first two years of academic university level studies for the transfer program. There are five or six two-year technological programs, the curriculums for which are designed by community advisory committees. These committees, upon which there are student representatives, take a very direct role in planning of the curriculum. Very direct. The third area of programming is the college preparatory program. In our case, unlike other institutions, we take in mature students at almost any age and provide them with up-grading courses to go where they want to go, at their speed, and on their terms. For example, a student may want to go into a technological program. He is 35, and he has spent 10 years in a chemistry lab., in industry. He needs English, mathematics and physics but no chemistry. A program will be designed by a counselling staff catering only for him, valid only in our institution, not in Bert Wales' institution or any other place in the province. Hopefully his level of sophistication will be such and we will have had sufficient tests of his accomplishment that the staff of Vancouver City College would be willing to take him where we have suggested that he left off with us. The fourth and final program of this institution is a rich fare of evening classes available for students - high school preparatory students as well as adult members of the community.

These four courses are operating simultaneously within the one institution and the architecture of the institutionhas been designed to facilitate intermingling among the various kinds of students, the faculty and the community. In addition to the help given by the architecture of the institution, there is at Selkirk College one staff that teaches the academic program as well as the technological program. We believe in integrated faculty, completely integrated student body and integrated services of all kinds. To such an extent have we tried to prevent differences of caste or status as between the academic program and the technical program that we have called one, the 'Applied Arts and Science' and the other, 'Liberal Arts and Science' in an effort to make as little distinction as possible between students in these various programs. Is there any other comment anyone wants to make on the determination of the curriculum?

DR. [illegible]:

Yes, it would seem to me, as I have listened to this, that the details of the programs are actually not worked out by the students. Their preferences are taken into account, information from different persons in the community is sought, but the actual design of the courses is not fundamentally a student proposition. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN:

Yes. Would you like to comment further on the curriculum, Mr. [illegible]?

MR. SISCO:

No, but perhaps I had better correct one impression. We do plan a general educational program in the College of Applied Arts and Technology. I had better start calling them community colleges like everyone else. And this is a distinct entity from the section 5 of the act 'University Transfer Program' that is in essence operated by the University on campus. But I would not like to leave the impression that we are strictly a technical, vocational, commercial type of thing without any general educational courses at all.

CHAIRMAN:

Any further comment on the curriculum? I would like to move, if I can, to the business of administration of the colleges. I wonder if you would like to make a first comment on this, Dr. Wales?

DR. WALES:

Well the model of course depends on the provincial legislation and in British Columbia there are two types of colleges. One is the district college which is operated within the area of one school district, the other is a regional college which is operated when several districts go together in connection with a college. In the first, these are all under the school act in general terms, but there has been no revision of the school act to give adequate details for specific patterns of organization, except in a very general way. In the Vancouver system, which is the district one, the Board of School Trustees is the official council or board of governors of the college. This is the legislative requirement. In the other areas - as you know Gordon - it is a combination of board representatives, some government representatives, and I believe some community representatives.

MR. SISCO:

In Ontario there is no local tax support so that, although the 18 college areas that Mr. Davis mentioned are administrative units, and the boards of governors will be chosen from these 18 areas, as far as the students are concerned they are completely free to go to any college. If they cannot get a course which they like in one they can go to another. There is no boundary. The legislation has been deliberately left very flexible. By setting up the Board of Governors as a local authority you get the building program and the management of the college outside of the civil service, so that you have a great deal more flexibility. The provincial Council of Regents really has a dual function: it is advisory to the Minister on many matters, but it has some very real power in the co-ordination of programs, in the approval of budgets and in rationalizing the development so that you do not get a development which is lopsided in one direction in one area of the Province and then overbalanced the other way in another area. We have deliberately tried to get the best of both worlds by having a sort of provincially supervised "bread and butter" program by means of which we may take some forward steps in the national need for recognizable levels of certification in some of the technical and business areas, and at the sametime give a lot of freedom to the local board of governors to inaugurate courses which have a local application or meet demands of the people in the locality.

CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Rees, in the province of Alberta there has been a junior college act, has there not, since 1958? Would you like to comment on that act?

DR. REES:

That act provides for the establishment of a college board, which would consist of members of school boards but it is quite distinct from any particular school board. A college may be established in a school district or in a series of school districts and counties. The board must consist of three members, I think the constitution of the board is not the important thing. They then would have to get approval from the university to offer university work and seek affiliation with the university. I think those are fundamental aspects.

MR. BEAUREGARD:

In the province of Quebec we have a general act planned which would cover the installation of this level of teaching and the public institutions which would dispense it. This act has not been adopted yet. We are hoping to have it pretty soon. The act foresees institutions of a semi-public nature, which is a new reality in Quebec, compared to private institutions which are giving this same kind of teaching, and state institutions which dispense technical courses. The act foresees a board of governors as the directing organism of these institutions. This would have very great powers in their administration. The board would comprise 15 to 18 members who would be elected as representatives of various elements of the community, as well as representatives of the teaching staff and students.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sisco I wonder if you would like to comment on how you feel the board of governors of a community college ought to carry out its responsibilities? Should it adopt the pattern of the university board of governors, or should it adopt the role or model of a board of trustees of a school? What is the way in which you see the board operating most effectively?

MR. SISCO:

You will not want me to go into the details of management that would normally fall to a board since it is the contractual body that will have to retain the staff and own, build and maintain the buildings and this type of thing. The legislation states that the Board of Governors can inaugurate courses with the permission of the Ontario Council of Regents, that it can issue certificates on its own authority for courses that do not fall within this provincial spectrum that I mentioned. We feel that if a

Board of Governors is to fulfill its real function, it must have something of a missionary's zeal in bringing the facilities of the college to the community, in studying the needs of that community in terms of post-secondary education, and in being able to offer what is needed for the public at large, and for specific industries and business and community groups We feel that the administrative function of the board of governors is only really half its role and that the much more important and more positive part is this feeling of wanting to bring the college out to the people of the area and to see that it reflects the needs and interests and demands of that particular public.

CHAIRMAN:

Would you want to comment on what you think the articulation ought to be between the board of governors of a college and the school board operating in that area?

MR. SISCO:

Well obviously there will have to be a great deal of articulation., We at one time considered putting a college under the local school board or a representation of the local school board. As a former secondary school teacher and principal I think I can say that, we were afraid to tie to the formal school system because we felt that there were real dangers involved. People conditioned to a formal school system might take that type of thinking into the college level where we did not feel that it belonged. So that as these Boards of Governors are appointed - and three of them are appointed to my knowledge, but the Minister says four so they must have completed one last night - you will notice that the people on them are very broadly representative of the total interests of the area. They include both men and women, business men, industrialists, representatives of the formal educational system, representatives of the university - if there is one in the area - representatives of organized labour. They are deliberately chosen so that they do not represent a single point of view, but rather so that they will be capable of the new approach and the missionary approach that I have outlined.

CHAIRMAN:

Yes thank you very much. Now in Alberta Dr. Johnson the Board of Governors of the Lethbridge Junior College consists of representatives from school boards, does it not?

DR. C.B.JOHNSON:
Lethbridge Junior College:

That is true.

CHAIRMAN:

Would you like to comment on the aims suggested by Mr. Sisco in Ontario as contrasted with the nine years of experience in the Lethbridge Junior College?

DR. JOHNSON:

The Lethbridge Junior College board has had a policy of giving not only the university transfer courses but also of extending a range of vocational courses and there is a section of the college devoted to that. In addition they are developing an extension program which will carry the instruction out into the community that is being served. These are the main features of the program at the moment.

CHAIRMAN:

One of the interesting features of the Lethbridge Junior College is that it has aspirations to university status. Do you think this is a normal outcome of most junior colleges that have had nine, ten or twelve years experience in Canada? Is this to be expected?

DR. JOHNSON:

Two years of university are now being offered at the Lethbridge Junior College, and in Medicine Hat and Red Deer which are much younger, you find pretty much university courses. Lethbridge certainly is striving to secure university status and whether they will be successful is anybody's guess at the moment. It could be that this might be a trend. We would hope not.

MR. SISCO:

I would like to comment on that tendency. I talked to an official of an American jurisdiction - who shall be nameless - and he said to me: "I envy you. You are in for five exciting years. You have got this new concept and everybody obviously is enthusiastic. But I tell you what will happen.In five years the staff will come to a meeting and they will pass a resolution that from here on they must be referred to as the faculty. A year after that they will all want to wear gowns. Two years after that they will be talking about increasing their image in the eyes of the public by raising their entrance requirements and raising their requirements as far as faculty is concerned. Then in about a ten-year cycle you will have a fourth rate liberal arts college with a few long-haired pedants strutting around with a handfull of students". Now we have admittedly stacked the cards everywhere we possibly could to prevent that from happening.

DR. WALES:

There are several points here I would like to comment on. In the first place, heaven forbid that all the colleges are going to be universities. The comment was made yesterday: "It is not that we need more of the same, but that we need more of something different". Let's not try to have more universities developing. In our particular case, we have universities to the east of us and universities to the west of us and right in the middle. Maybe in ten years time things will be different, but I do not think so. Our board's decision on all of this was based on its extensive experience in adult education. As a board for fifty years it has operated night schools for adults in the community, for thirty-five years it has operated an art school at the post-secondary level and for fifteen years it has operated a vocational school. Activities were based on the need for this kind of program in the community. An adult high school was also needed and a better way of doing our grade 13, which in British Columbia has not developed the same as in Ontario. These were the needs around which the Vancouver City College has developed. The main concern is the non-university-oriented student, but it is recognized that there are very many people who do not really know what they want. It is also a fact that in British Columbia a great many people fail one or two grade 12 examinations. There are no examinations except in June, so a person with a 'sup' has to wait a year to get into university. There is a need for providing general education of an academic type for some of these people. We are not looking toward a university aspiration. I would like to make one other comment. Should boards of education run this type of centre? The comment was made that there is a fear this will result in the traditional elementary-secondary approach to the teaching of adults. This is a hazard. It is also a hazard that you will get another board in a community offering competing educational services, and you will have a duplication of services. We have had a lot of this in Canada, with a lot of separate little compartments. Whether or not a board runs a centre is dependent on two other factors, and one is the financing. In British Columbia part of the cost is met through local taxation and heaven forbid having a third tax levy within the community. We have one for general taxes, one for education, and if we had a separate college board we would then have one for the college board: two competing taxes for education, which would be a bad situation. In Ontario the colleges are provincially supported. This makes a difference. Another point I think that could be considered is the fact that the secondary school system in the urban areas, and I am sure this is general all across Canada, now has millions of dollars of darn good facilities. If you have your college program tied into the community through its school system, all these facilities become available. In Vancouver it is recognized by our high school principals that the night school department takes over at 6 o'clock or even at 4 o'clock by arrangement, and all the facilities are there for the using. One of the criticisms we get a great deal is: why aren't the schools used more than from 9 - 3? If the college organization is developed in connection with the school system, and if the college serves the working person who can only come at night time, your basic core around which the services are offered can flow over and use all the resources of the community instead of having to go and ask for them.

CHAIRMAN:

It has occurred to me that we have arrived at a point where we have a sufficient amount of data that we might invite questions from the floor. This particular issue which we are discussing now, the role of school boards in the operation of a district or regional college, is a critical one in which there is some variation across Canada. In British Columbia, for example, we are obliged to go to the people twice: first in a plebiscite in order to ask whether in principle the region or district is interested in the establishment of a college. If there is a positive vote, then later a referendum is held in which the people are asked to contribute on the basis of municipal taxation, such monies to be shared with provincial and federal government funds.

DR. STEWART:

I think really this is a very fundamental question. I recall Dr. Medsker's comment yesterday that this emerging component of the total educational system may in the long run be the dominant element. Now if we have this kind of view of the prospects in this post-school non-university area associated in a basic way with total adult services in the community, then it seems to me that we must in the long run accept the establishment of a new jurisdiction here, primarily directed to these particular functions. For this reason I think it would be unfortunate- taking the long term view point - if we became committed to attaching this new function as an appendage either to the school system or to the university system. I think it has to be an entity in itself.

Now I am very conscious of the problems that Dr. Wales has mentioned of the use of facilities. But it does not seem to me impossible that the facilities of the schools should be made available outside of their normal hours for another authority, through arrangement with the schools. I have come to this conclusion very reluctantly because I have appreciated greatly what the school boards have done in the Lethbridge situation which is based upon representation from the school board. And I know how well Vancouver, as well, has done based upon the school system. But taking a long term viewpoint and having a real concept of where this is leading us my firm conviction is that we have to accept another jurisdiction here and not tie in either with the schools or the university.

MR. HOWARD DAY, VANCOUVER CITY COLLEGE:

Mr. Chairman, are two questions permissible rather than a comment? First of all to Mr. Sisco of the Department of Education, Ontario. He said they had done all they could to stack the cards against the soggy cycle he described where the academics, after ten years, would take over in a musty corridor with a few students. Now how are they going to prevent this if the faculties are indeed hooked to the universities?

CHAIRMAN:

Can we put that one directly to you Mr. Sisco?

MR. SISCO:

Are you implying that the faculties of these colleges will in some way be hooked to universities?

MR. DAY:

I understand you are going to teach your academic core under the supervision and direction of the universities.

MR. SISCO:

No, the college is a separate entity in itself. It will have general educational programs, but these will be tied, for various reasons including economic ones to an application of the subject as well. You may well study liberal subjects but included in your options will be an application of these in the field of social work or journalism, for instance, if you study English, and so on. Now if there is some reason, because of remoteness of the college area, why the students in that area cannot go to a university as an alternative, then the Board of Governors is empowered to enter into an agreement with the university for the university to offer university courses, at university prices, with university-approved staff, for university credits. But administratively, and as far as the total concept is concerned, the college is completely divorced from the universities in Ontario.

MR. DAY:

I am not quite fully satisfied with the answer and this is why I have the second question, Mr. Chairman. This is directed to Dr. Rees of Alberta. I would like to know what the experience has been at the Lethbridge College as far as the tie in with the University of Alberta has been concerned.

DR. REES:

The Lethbridge Junior College has used regular university courses designed by the University of Alberta. In future they will be designed by the University of Calgary but there will be no difference at university level between the courses or examinations.

MR. DAY:

Thanks. Now I would like to ask Mr. Cousins from Lethbridge College to comment on the difference of opinion amongst the staff members, those teaching academic and those teaching technological and other courses in the college. I think he might have some light to shed here.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Cousins is not a member of the panel, but I wonder if he would be happy to comment?

MR. W. J. COUSINS, Lethbridge Junior College:

Ladies and gentlemen, our College does have the dichotomy that Conant talks about between the arts and education, but we have it between arts and vocational training. For example, our faculty wanted to set up positions of rank, a system of associate and full professors. When the vocational people wanted a similar salary schedule, immediately the arts faculty said: Good Lord!! Are we going to have a full professor of plumbing? So we had this kind of split. This is the sort of thing we are struggling with. When we introduced our second year, it became a senior year. This was beyond a junior college and we had to get better qualified faculties. They immediately felt their academic status was being questioned when they had to write the same examinations as Calgary or use the same text books, even though we had been quite happy to give the same course with the same numbers, using the same text books, and writing the same examinations, even though we marked them ourselves. The university was very, very careful to let go a little bit at a time until we had established ourselves and were able to prove that the product which we sent to the University of Alberta was as good as the product which they were turning out themselves. Now we are finding greater pressure as we have applied for affiliation with the new University of Calgary, for more separation especially on the senior course level in the choosing of courses, the picking of text books, the setting of the examinations. A lot of people, you see, feel that their academic qualifications are being questioned.

CHAIRMAN:

Would you say that in responding to the critical technological educational crisis of our time that the Lethbridge Junior College was in fact a social invention offering something new or indeed more of the same?

MR. COUSINS:

Oh no, we did have the California Junior College as the "cross" which shone above us all, but Alberta was a unique situation and everything that we did was unique. Our motto should have been "we are different" because when it came to choosing courses, for example, we went to the National Employment Service - nobody has ever thought of that here - to find out what sort of jobs are needed in our community. Secondly, we sent around questionnaires to the schools to find out what the students thought they needed and what the principals thought they needed. Then we called in committees of industry on two levels: one to tell us what is going to happen in the next ten years and one to tell us what we need right now. And so it was completely locally-oriented. But although the vocational section does have that distinction, we are working together very well under one administration, and the vocational work is developing now so that we now not only have transfer to the university, but we have transfer to the institutes of technology as well, and our own terminal courses.

DR. C. B. JOHNSON:

I subscribe completely to what Dean Cousins has said. First, I would like to make one or two comments. One is that Dr. Rees, Chief Superintendent of our Province has said that the junior colleges act was passed in 1958 which is absolutely true - that was to legalize the Lethbridge Junior College which began in 1957. Secondly, I would like to indicate that we are university-oriented in as far as the university section is concerned and we do have these problems that Dean Cousins mentioned. But this year we began on a very very modest scale taking people of slightly inferior matriculation standing and I am not quite certain as to what the outcome was. At the time that I left on three months' leave of absence there seemed to be some hope for the people who were not quite matriculation - meaning 6?% average in all the examination subjects. In other words we are experimenting as well as carrying through with the regular university courses.

CHAIRMAN:

We are just beginning now on one of the most critical aspects of the development of community colleges across Canada - the governing body, its nature, its composition and its capacity to relate to the community and to develop changes as changes are required.

DR. JOHNSON:

With respect to administration, I should like to say this, that we definitely are locally-oriented towards the kinds of things that are required as already indicated by our Dean.

CHAIRMAN:

Dean Smith of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Alberta.

DEAN SMITH:

I should introduce myself as one of Lethbridge's problems. I have been Chairman of the University of Alberta Committee on Junior Colleges for some time. Now with the separation of the two universities of Calgary and Alberta we have still a co-ordinating council and the Committee on Junior Colleges will remain as a committee of that co-ordinating Council. It is charged with several responsibilities and one of them is to supervise the staffs of junior colleges. And it is there that generally speaking I have played the role of the mean old man who says "No". The organization in Alberta has been one of affiliation in which the universities control university courses. The pattern in the United States is one of creditation in which the various junior colleges have a great deal of freedom to organize and ultimately to transfer. In the United States, however, the programs in universities are much more flexible. As long as Canadian universities have [illegible] controlled program, transfer must be geared to that program. The experience in Alberta, I believe is that when the junior colleges have been established they have known from the beginning that their students would be accepted at the University of Alberta and that the University of Alberta would stand behind those students who wished to transfer elsewhere. I must confess that I am as yet unconvinced that the students at Vancouver City College - for they have a great deal of academic autonomy - will in fact be able to obtain credit at the universities of British Columbia. This, I think, they have to find out in the future: certainly I have to find out.

CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Selman, who is assistant to the President of the University of British Columbia might like to make a comment.

MR. SELMAN:

The comment is very much along the line of the one we have just heard. It is really a question. First of all let me say briefly that to the best of my knowledge things are going forward in such a way in British Columbia - thanks very largely to the way in which Dr. Wales and those associated with him are approaching the whole problem of transfer - that we can take some assurance about the prospects for transfer and for satisfactory connections between the College and the universities. And as far as I know this is also true of the other colleges which are coming along, notably Selkirk which is the most advanced of the others. But the question I wanted to ask relates to this - as it applies to the Ontario situation. One of the advantages, one of the benefits to be gained it seems to me from the community colleges is the increased degree of flexibility, or willingness on the part of the colleges to accept students who do not come with the standard sort of academic background and to allow them to try their wings and to find their place, I am speaking now of the transfer students, so that when they come out at the end of the two-year academic program in the community college, and to the degree that they are acceptable to the universities, they can get back into the stream. I also recognize the fact that universities, on the whole, are pretty conservative institutions and I am wondering in the Ontario situation if you are counting on the universities being increasingly flexible with respect to the kind of people they will accept into the academic program that may go in the community college. As I understand it they are under the control of the universities. Are we counting on this happening or is there some other machinery in the situation which will allow us to get the benefits of the increased flexibility we see in the community college? It is a question I would like to put to Mr. Sisco. How they are going to deal with this aspect of the students' interest?

MR. SISCO:

In developing a general educational program we certainly feel that the universities - and many of them privately have expressed this view - will be interested in the type of student who is a late bloomer or who comes back at a mature age and who demonstrates, not on the basis of university entrance qualifications but on the basis of good sound general educational courses, that he has potential at the university. And the Minister is planning to set up a study committee composed of university people, of departmental officials and representatives from the Council of Regents for the colleges to look at this whole problem of university acceptance of college programs, based on their own merits, as entrance into either beginning or advanced standing in the universities.

Now at the present time in our institute of technology programs and in our business administration programs which are operating in the institutes of technology, a student who graduates with honours after three years - and remember from Ontario's point of view this kid has never been in grade 13 - is admissible to second year applied science in any one of the universities of Ontario and in the second year of the business administration course of those universities that operate business administration courses. So in a sense we have a form of advanced standing at the present time.

MR. W. A. JENKINS: Nova Scotia Agricultural College

It becomes increasingly evident to me that what we are talking about now is the two-year college and the two-year college means many things to many people. On this point of a Board of Governors I do not see how we can equate the junior college, to the community college, to the technical institute, to the branch campus of the university, in this context of a Board of Governors. I suggest that we must return to a strict definition of the community college if we are going to discuss a governing board.

MR. HAROLD BRAUN, Lakehead University

Mr. Sisco has said essentially what I had in mind. I, however, have one or two points. We started out as a technical institute after World War II. We then became the Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology which was essentially a junior college. We are now the Lakehead University, but we still have technology programs associated with us, and we have had a lot of experience over the years with transfer of students from the technology program to the university program. I think I can say that we have had excellent co-operation from all the universities outside the Province. The transfer in my mind is not made on the basis of equivalent courses, but in the case of the student having sufficient ability to fit into the other program and we have found this worked quite well. I think all the universities are looking for students of this calibre and will continue to do so.

MR. STEPHEN DAVIDOVICH, Ontario Department of Civil Services.

I am wondering about the people who are not so much concerned about whether they are going to get a certificate or not, but whether they will have an opportunity to learn something they want to know, whether that learning is connected with living, being a citizen, being a parent, or being a member of the community. I think the experience in California has been that post-university education at night is very often taken advantage of by the most educated people of the community. What about these people and their participation in determining what they are going to learn? What provisions does the community college make to meet the needs of people of this kind?

MR. F. N. A. ROWELL, President, Canadian School Trustees' Association
Member Vancouver School Board.

With regard to the matter of control. In British Columbia there has been some experience with departmental-operated institutions. We have eight vocational schools; one is administered by the Vancouver School Board, the other seven are administered by the department. In these departmental schools in many areas of the Province there are vacancies simply because the local type of citizens' committee integrating industry and labour is not as effective when you have a departmental-organized program. Now while the department of education would be very interested in securing the Vancouver Vocational Institute from the Vancouver School Board, Dr. Wales has developed very strong liaison committees with the result that this example of local control demonstrates the close tie in with the community. This is the point which is usually of greatest concern over Ontario's program. While it is announced that the Board of Governors will be locally appointed, we do not necessarily see that universities in the past have identified themselves entirely with local needs. In Vancouver, for example, many of the teachers in the system get their Master of Education by going to Western Washington College in Bellingham, simply because the staff at Bellingham are more flexible than the staff in the University of British Columbia in establishing needful courses.

Now Dr. Smith made some reference to transfer students. I think it is very important to educators in the rest of Canada to realize that when you talk about British Columbia you have to refer to universities. The University of British Columbia is not the only university in B.C. at the present time and we have just heard this morning from the panel that a student from the Vancouver City College is transferring to the Simon Fraser University. Simon Fraser has been more co-operative in working with Vancouver City College than has the University of British Columbia. From the point of view of students it does not really matter whether they transfer to the University of Victoria, or to Simon Fraser or to U.B.C. and it would be unimportant whether any of them went to U.B.C. or not. I think the issue then to watch in the future is whether the centralized control in Ontario or the more democratic method of operation in Alberta and British Columbia will prove out. I believe that local taxation is essential to these institutions in some part.

CHAIRMAN:

I think, ladies and gentlemen, that we are talking about two things. I would like to separate them if I can and ask for any comment there might be on question of government. We are talking about the power structure and the variety of ways across Canada in which the Boards of Directors, or the Boardsof Governors are appointed and how they operate. You know Pope has an interesting couplet where he says: " For forms of government let fools contest, What'er is best administered is best". This is a very cynical comment indeed, and we have got some really powerfully important problems in the question of government. For example, in the old Okanagan region where there has been great hope a regional college might be established,priority has been given to the establishment of a regional college in this area by the department of education, there has been a vast degree of friction as to the nature of its government and getting it underway. That may happen this year, it may not. It has been in a sense a sorry spectacle, but it is one of the kinds of things that can happen when there is no clear delineation of how a government of a college should be appointed and how it gets underway.

MR. J. T. [illegible], Collegiate Institute Board of Ottawa

I would just like to return momentarily to the situation of boards of governors and local boards. I am here in a dual capacity,partly for my employer and also as a member of the Ottawa Collegiate Institute Board. Now I am not saying that everything is lovely in the garden, but I do want to take issue with an implication that school trustees are inflexible people and will carry forth their format into a community college. Well, I resent that, I do not think we are all that bad. As Norman Sisco knows, our Board were asked and we presented a slate of nominations for the Board of Governorsfor a community college which we hope is established in our community, and to my knowledge no trustee's name was on that Board and no trustee wanted to have his name on that Board. But we did want to give it an autonomy and we did want to give it support. I think that possibly the Board stole Bert Curtis - to whom incidentally I want to pay tribute and say how awfully glad we are we stole him - from the University of British Columbia. We gave leadership in this regard. Possibly our role is now finished. We hope we will have a community college. We have offered a building even and we believe that this should be centrally located in the City of Ottawa on a multi-campus because we have already the Eastern Ontario Institute of Technology and we have the Ontario Vocational Centre. But I do want to emphasize the fact that there are many many civil servants who are living in central Ottawa, in rooms and so on and who are in a downtown area. I do make a pitch for a complete independence and yet co-operation on the two functions.

MR. TOM DENNETT, Vancouver City College

The Minister of Education of Ontario said that transfer from the American community colleges to the universities was becoming a problem and I was wondering whether anyone knew if this was because of lack of communication or because they had set low standards for their transfer students, or just what was behind this situation.

MR. SISCO:

Mr. Davis made that comment all right, but he made it off-the-cuff. It was not written in the speech. I am not sure what jurisdiction Mr. Davis was referring to, but I know that in the college transfer programs in some jurisdictions with limited university facilities there is difficulty on the part of people who complete the two-year program and then present themselves at a university where they frequently have to write competitive examinations. In that sense there is no assurance that successful completion of the two-year college transfer program is going to get them admission to a degree course.

DR. D. SHAGER, New College, University of Toronto

There was one comment that was made earlier this morning which struck a rather sympathetic note. That was that persons who had been associated with the secondary school system might be conditioned to a rather traditional system. Mr. Sisco made this remark and made it with reference to the Board of Governors. I was a little concerned when the Minister announced that the former Technological and Trades Training Branch which was now to be called the Applied Arts and Technology Branch would likely be the executive arm of the Council of Regents. I am wondering if the point which Mr. Sisco made regarding those conditioned by the traditional system is even more applicable to this executive arm and whether, if he can be objective in answering this question, he does not think that an autonomous organization composed of persons drawn from universities, industry, high school and as broad a range of educational organizations as possible would better serve the Council of Regents than the department of education.

MR. SISCO:

Well that is not an easy question, and I guess it was not meant to be. As a civil servant I have to live in the world as it is. The plain fact of the matter is that the government of Ontario, with the support we devoutly hope of the federal government in Ottawa, is paying 100% of this particular development with no taxation. Now admittedly you have to strike a happy balance. No government authority is going to develop what is in essence a third publically supported level of education by handing out multi-million dollar amounts to authorities and saying: "go ahead and spend it anyway you like". There is admittedly some administrative control of the development and this is a political fact of life. Whether it is desirable or not isn't really relevant, that is exactly what it is. Now the people in my Branch are mostly products of the existing post-secondary system, the institutes of technology and the vocational centres, as well as people who have been recruited, some of them with university experience, some of them with industrial experience, and so on. The Branch itself is not imbued with tradition and we are not people who are going to try and set up a rigid structure. Now I think the proof that we do mean business as far as decentralizing control is in the fact that at the present time we are operating six institutes of technology and six vocational centres and these represent in the City of Ottawa alone the investment of something like eight million dollars. These are to be given away to the Boards of Governors. We are completely abandoning the field of direct operation of any post-secondary institutions whatsoever, and all our existing ones will be put under the umbrella of the community college legislation and under the control and ownership of the local Board of Governors as quickly as the legislation can be processed.

Comment:

If I could make this comment in regard to transfer for advanced standing in American universities. I was visiting one of the fairly large state universities recently and the man in charge of the department of engineering made the statement that 75% of his students in first year engineering were not taking the full program, but were taking partial programs making-up for deficiencies that were necessary because of transfer. Obviously we could not do this in our Canadian universities, nor could they do this in the smaller American universities. And I think this is the problem which they were referring to.

MR. SISCO:

Well the comment that I would like to make is that at the present time, and I do not know what the averages are in the other provinces, but about 12 to 15% of students who enter high school go on to university. In Ontario, despite all the talk about universities taking credits of a formal or informal nature, we are deliberately trying to do something for the next 40 to 50% of the population who presently are not going to university and who probably never will. We are spending 60 or 70% of our time this morning worrying about what we think will be no more than 5% of the total enrollment of our community colleges. I would point out that this is the same old story of the "tail wagging the dog".

DR. WALES:

I want to "wag the tail" too because for British Columbia in 1965 22% of our students who left high school started college and 12% went on to get degrees. Now this is a very small percentage of the total population in whom we are all interested. And we should be just as interested in the persons who have no university intentions as in those who do have. Unfortunately because we condition people to university, and there has been no other institution, nearly everybody thinks he is going to graduate from university. Many people start in colleges or other places with that in mind. This points up the importance of good counselling. Secondly, even though they get university entrance standing in British Columbia they cannot necessarily get into U.B.C. So what is the difference between not necessarily being able to get into U.B.C. from a college, when they cannot get in now from grade 12 unless they have 60% or better? But they can get into a university and this is a point that is quite important. Third point, our particular experience is that about 5% of our people even think of going on beyond the second year.

The fourth point I would like to make is that we have in writing from the University of British Columbia, a statement which I would like to read: "A student who chooses courses at a college that are appropriate to his academic objective at the university, and who obtains adequate standing in them, will be accepted for further studies at the University of British Columbia under the same conditions that apply to a student who has taken all his post-secondary studies in the university." Now I do not know what kind of guarantee university people think a college should have before they will believe a college credit is respectable. Last week I had the privilege of having a president of a Toronto university visit with us and we went out to Simon Fraser and met with Dr. McTaggart-Cowan. About half of the discussion centered around the intimate and close relationship and liaison between the College in Vancouver and the instant University at Burnaby. It was pointed out by Dr. McTaggart-Cowan that within the first year of operation of both there had been shifting both ways. And I think this is good.

CHAIRMAN:

Can I second that observation. At Selkirk College we have been astonished by the degree of co-operation, of guidance and help given to us by the three provincial universities of British Columbia. It has been astonishing. I would like to comment also on the observation that Bert Wales made that, while we have twenty-five courses available in the first two years of transfer program, we have twenty-seven courses available for the technological students, but we fully expect three-quarters of our students are going to enroll in the academic program and only one-quarter of our students initially will enroll in our technical program. We are asking for patience from the point of view of our faculty and our community in developing our technological program to utilize our facilities and staff. Because for years and years our community has been conditioned to believe that the only road to heaven was a B.A.,an M.A. and Ph.D., that this was the glory road and if you took this glory road you would not be carrying a lunch bucket you would be carrying a brief case, and that is what you ought to be carrying. Now it is awfully hard to get students to go into a technological program, and make the commitment that for years and years they will not be carrying a brief case. We have a real job to do to educate our community on the dignity of our technological program.

DR. C. B. JOHNSON:

I agree with Dr. Wales, heaven forbid that all colleges are going to become universities. Nevertheless, I should like to make a little plea for the Lethbridge Junior College. Namely that we are close to the border and there has been a terrific trend of students going across the border - to our fine neighbours to the South - to universities such as Idaho, the University of Washington and so on. I want to make the comment that we feel we do have a unique situation. Now I want to get to my question, but first a little background, for I think it is very important we live in a rather sparsely populated area, number one. Number two, we live in an area where primary industries are practically nil. Number three, services, as such, are predominating in our area. Now earlier in the morning I heard that we should have advisory councils with respect to the different technical vocational courses that should be offered at any community college. These we have. But we have one problem, and the problem is simply this. Some, I am not saying all, advisory councils say: We believe you should have such and such a program, we believe that the program that you now have outlined after two or three meetings is a good one. But it is lip-service only because we find that they want to continue to employ people who have not been educated at the college or anywhere else and keep them at their apprenticeship level for more than one year and thus secure services at a lower cost. This is a fundamental problem. What suggestions could come out of this very refined group of men and women whereby we can overcome some of the reluctance on the part of some employers (and notice I am using the word 'some" in two cases), to hire at a higher wage which would induce young people to come into such very fine courses as electricity, which as far as the Lethbridge Junior College is concerned is a complete flop. With respect to sheet metal, this was another complete flop, and yet both industries pay good wages, they are respectable industries, they are in great demand in other parts of Canada. I do not believe that ours is a unique problem. What suggestions are there?

MR. GORDON SELMAN:

I was left a little uncomfortable this morning by the comments we heard regarding the involvement of students in curriculum development and in teacher evaluation. My experience in adult education, and now what I am hearing from the deans at University of British Columbia, leads me to believe that it is not only sound in terms of educational planning but extremely productive, effective from any point of view, to involve students in both of these things. Perhaps when we are setting up whole new programs in one area or another we have to lean to a very large extent on industry, the consumer, the experts in the various fields to help set up the curriculum. I am sure that this is true. But I think that we can learn a great deal about curriculum development, about how these curricula should be revised in various ways as we go along, by consulting students as they complete the program, perhaps at particular stages on the way, and also our students after they have had a chance to go out and work for a year or two or more in the career for which they were being prepared. At the University of British Columbia this last year the students in the faculty of science turned out a book called "Black and Blue". It was a book about teachers and courses evaluation. I do not know whether "Black and Blue" was the condition in which the students felt they were, or the condition in which the faculty were going to be after the book was published, but regardless of this the matter was done in an extremely effective, fair and objective way. The institution is, I am sure, a great deal richer for this effort on the port of students to contribute to curriculum building and to teacher evaluation. All my experience, and what I hear from the deans in our institution leads me to believe that we should not write off at all the contribution which students can make to these two aspects of running our institutions.

CHAIRMAN:

I would just like to make one or two comments. I think today we have dealt with the problem of controls and the problem of curriculum, touching some of the most vital and sensitive areas in community colleges across Canada. I think we have heard a number of descriptions of the form which these institutions are taking in response to provincial legislation, in response to community needs, in response to other kinds of pressures. May I suggest, as one who was on the firing line of working out together with Dr. Wales new forms of legislation and new forms of colleges appropriate to our communities in British Columbia, that there is a vast variety of ways in which communities respond educationally. Dr. Wales is director of a district college in an enlarged urban setting in which there are three universities. Our college, not far removed from Vancouver, is quite a different "kettle of fish". It has a different clientele, it has a different kind of community, and is responding in a different kind of way. But the problem of government, the problem of power, the problem of politics is an extraordinarily important one and it surprises me a bit today that we have not heard more about the honourable and essentially important aspect of politics, in the development and growth of community colleges across Canada. All of us know it is there and highly desirable because we live ostensibly in a democracy, and hopefully our colleges have a direct contribution to make to the principles of our democratic society.

I would like to thank on your behalf every member of our panel, in particular Mr. Fisher. We heard from him at length earlier and somehow did not get to hearing his comments from time to time which I think would have been most valuable. It is appropriate that Mr. Selman concluded as our last speaker by stressing the importance of student participation in planning and I would have thought in the government at one level or another of colleges. And I think Mr. Fisher you have been speaking for a good number of thousands of students presently in institutions of this kind, but probably even more importantly in the interests of the planning that is now being done on behalf of many many thousands yet to come into community colleges across Canada.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR ARISING FROM GROUP DISCUSSION

QUESTION:

Would the Ontario system as proposed to us here today be applicable to other provinces and do they in turn have as much confidence in their various ministers and departments to do the job in the same way.

CHAIRMAN:

What do you mean by the Ontario system?

QUESTION:

One that is proposed to us today, to be largely everything else but oriented towards the transfer situation.

DR. WALES:

I do not think it would be applicable to British Columbia because of the fact that there are three provincial universities now and a private one and this seems to be enough of that particular form of higher education for the next few years. Rather than increase the number of universities, the recommendation of the report on higher education was the development of two-year colleges with programs of up to two years which would provide an academic parallel, but not an identical program to universities. The situation is quite different in Ontario where you have sixteen universities and, we heard this morning, more places in universities than will be needed up to 1970. In British Columbia the situation is that we have as many universities as we think we can use at this time. We want to take the pressures off the universities and let them do the more advanced work and also decentralize opportunity through the province without introducing more universities. So there is a difference in function.

DR. REES:

I should think one possibility in Alberta would be to ensure that a range of programs is offered apart from the university transfer.

QUESTION: William Pierce, Frontier College:

Is it realistic to think of community colleges in terms of independent institutions,administratively speaking as a level independent by itself, when in fact we must foresee an organic co-ordination between curricula of community colleges and both secondary school and university levels? How do we reconcile these two concepts?

CHAIRMAN:

I have a feeling that Dr. Stewart who after all bridges many types of experience in these situations might want to make a comment particularly on the point of view of the university.

DR. STEWART:

Well obviously setting up a third force, if you like, in the total system does create some very real problems of articulation and it is a legitimate question to ask whether these problems would be reduced if you had two systems, one enlarged, rather than three systems. There are undoubtedly very difficult articulation problems both with the schools as the stream comes up to the college and, in so far as we face this transfer problem, across to the university. If you leave the university substantially out of it then your problems of articulation are largely between the schools and this new force. I think it is a matter of judgment as to how significant the peculiar functions of this force are going to be, and, therefore, whether it is better to set up another force and let them work out their articulation problems with the school. My own feeling about this is that we should set up the third force and we will have to face the articulation problems.

CHAIRMAN:

Can I observe that the articulation is at once with the universities and with the high school, but also with transfer within the institution from the academic program to the technological program or, in our case, vice versa. There is a high degree of flexibility involved.

QUESTION: William Pierce:

This one is directed towards Mr. Sisco and particularly the Ontario legislation. I do not really see any place in the Ontario system for adult education as such. It seems to me that the system that you have drawn up with your legislation leads directly from the grade 12 technical and science program into two more years of the same thing only more advanced. I am wondering if you can explain to us just how you intend to fit any adult education or adult student into your program on either the technical or academic side.

MR. SISCO:

First if you have indeed read the legislation, as you say, you are aware that the entrance requirements to a College of Applied Arts and Technology are grade 12 graduationfrom any stream, or 19 years of age regardless of previous education, with no qualification. It is true that the part of the program which the Minister explained in detail today is really a program for people coming out of the secondary school or people coming back into it. But he also mentioned that we feel that our program should be parallel both as to day and night, and that we feel very strongly that a great many of our existing adult programs - some of them operated under program 5 and 4 - can be meshed into the college format. I would feel that, with the local delegation of powers to the local level, if there is not any real adult program in terms of meeting community needs either for up-grading, or for interest groups, or for evening qualification for day school programs, then there is something very radically wrong. We feel at this time that the adult enrollment, the off-formal hours enrollment, should be at least equal to, if not greater than the daytime enrollment. I do not really plead guilty to the charge that there is no room for adult education.

DEAN SMITH:

I find myself acting as deputy leader at our table in the absence of the leader who was appointed. But I can assure you that my first question has nothing to do with the universities nor Alberta. We want to ask another question about the Ontario set up. It is a multi-barrelled question I am afraid. First of all, what autonomy do the local Boards of Governors have in organizing programs and curricula in the Ontario program? What is the possibility of duplication and who is responsible for avoiding duplication either with the existing services in institutions which are there now, or within new institutions that will be developed? And finally, are the plans for the programs approved by the Board of Regents or by the Department of Education or both if there is any limitation on autonomy?

MR. SISCO:

The Board of Governors has spelled out in the legislation the right to introduce programs of a local nature or of a particular nature and issue certificates for these. The rationalizing body is the provincial Council of Regents, which is really non-governmental and non-political, but is there to co-ordinate the program so that, if a program should be across 18 colleges it will be across 18 colleges because it meets a provincial need, whereas if it meets a local need only then it may be offered in one college only. Now the Council of Regents, and some members are here, would certainly jump up and beat their breasts if I suggested they were a creature of the Department of Education. They might be influenced by the Minister, but more as a person rather than as an official. They have tremendous freedom of action in the approval of local programs and the Board of Governors has certainly complete freedom of action in introducing programs that are of a local application.

CHAIRMAN:

In British Columbia we have something comparable to the Board of Regents called the Academic Board presided over by Dean Chant, former Dean of Arts and Science at the University of British Columbia. We relate to them in a way that is not altogether clear yet, but we really respect their position. We think it is going to be a help in interpreting our needs to the academic institutions and to the government. We believe we have a friend at court in the Academic Board. The way in which community colleges relate to this Academic Board for higher education is not quite clear. I think this is an extremely important question. Are you satisfied with the response, Dean Smith?

DEAN SMITH:

To what extent is duplication likely with the existing facilities or with new ones? What percent of the existing technical program will a new technical program duplicate?

MR. SISCO:

None, because all our existing post-secondary technical institutions will be part of the regional college. There will not be two entities. We are not going to spend money to compete with ourselves. As I said this morning, every institution of a post-secondary nature that we have is going to be given away to a Board of Governors as part of their complex. We certainly are not going to compete with ourselves with provincial money in two different institutions.

CHAIRMAN:

Dean Smith, you might be interested in a comment that was made to us by the faculty of the University of British Columbia when they said of our academic program: "Please do not ape what we are doing. There are so many faults with what we are doing, we would not want you to repeat our errors. Create a program which is acceptable to the third year of our university, programs which are similar, comparable but not identical, to what we are already doing." It is a refreshing position I think for a university to take. These are their comments and I think they said the same to you, Dr. Wales.

DR. PER STENSLAND, University of Saskatchewan:

Obviously the situation and conditions in the community set the frame-work for our discussion about what we teach and how we teach and how we administer. But at our table we were concerned with freedom and the freedom of setting up a new institution. So will all of you please comment on the following question. What are the guiding principles that should make it possible for us to give people freedom to participate in planning a program - students, community and teachers. We believe that when you talk about freedom to participate in planning you have to be a little more precise, maybe a little bolder. I am reminded of a statement, by a Norwegian,and I am very conscious of the fact that I am a Swede. Ibsen once said that when you fight for freedom you do not put on your best trousers. I thought you had your best trousers on this morning. Would you put on your labouring trousers and discuss how we can give real freedom to students, community and teachers to participate in planning a new institution?

MR. FISHER:

I would like to say that from a student point of view I think the planning of participation comes at perhaps two levels. One of course is the student council, the student body that operates within any college or university. One of the things one would want to watch here is the kind of people who get on student councils, because often you get the rabble rouser or the person who is really interested in hearing only himself and not particularly interested in seeing things improved within the setting itself. The area I think that students should stay clear of - as I mentioned earlier this morning - is that of the responsibilities of the administration.

CHAIRMAN:

Now I think there are some members of the faculty of a community college here and I would like to invite them to comment if they wish to.

MISS MARIANNE BOSSEN, Lakehead University:

Certain terms have been used such as student interest, student participation, local needs, needs of the community, industry needs, and also in a lot of contexts we have heard concern expressed about interprovincial mobility. I am thinking of the need for mobility from one institution to another. In other words mobility within the educational system. I do not think in curriculum planning we can ignore the sphere of local needs, of student needs, but I would like to introduce an idea that lifts it out of accidental factors and environmental factors and may help to provide at least a common basis, and that is to look at the problem from the point of view of occupational requirements. Occupation in the sense of a family of jobs with common relationships and there are techniques for analyzing occupations. In other words I would suggest occupational analysis such as is practised, for instance, in the federal Civil Service Commission. I have used some of their work in trying to establish what I should teach, what method I might use, what I should expect of students who are going to be technicians. The national employment service has done work in this respect and I rather expect there will be more work in the context of labour market policy and programs. Since there is a suggestion that students should participate, I must assume there is some dissatisfaction. So to provide a common basis this less personal, less localized approach, might be used.

MR. HOWARD DAY, Vancouver City College:

A year ago there wasn't a faculty association at Vancouver City College. We had all emerged from an adult education centre where we had been associated with the British Columbia teachers' federation as a local within Vancouver. And we struck a committee of five to maintain liaison with the Vancouver School Board as development requirements should emerge. By September we had elected an executive and assigned committees to each of the members thereof and were proceeding with professional development, consideration of salary, of course, the matter of insurance, the matter of indemnity and any other problems which we thought a professional faculty should be broaching. In that list I have mentioned professional development and on our faculty council there were representatives of the departments within the college itself and the department heads were given responsibility in the development of curriculum. Staff members themselves, in liaison with the university, with considerable consultation among themselves and in many instances with business groups within the community, drew up the brief outline of the courses we should offer in the first year. Now this has been a continuing process, but I would like to point out that the faculty association itself is deeply involved in curriculum planning.

DR. STENSLAND:

We suggested then if you are concerned with freedom you have to be concerned with the legitimate contralizing forces in our society. So we would ask how you would reconcile this concern for freedom with a justified attention to the need for some central control. There are obvious central controls - legislation, accountability, professional standards, and so on. How do you reconcile this central control with concern for freedom?

CHAIRMAN:

This is the eternal problem!

MR. SISCO:

Well this is a fact of life in a democracy. I get the feeling sometimes that there is a real confusion between freedom and licence. After all we do live in a democracy. The policies that were put forward by the Minister today have had to have legislative approval. Admittedly it is a provincial program, admittedly there is some direction in some areas from the central government, this is a fact of democratic life. If you can design a program so that everyone can run down his own alley no matter who it affects, and at public expense, then I would like to hear about it. But as far as I am concerned I am not very worried about the situation.

CHAIRMAN:

I would like to make comment if I may in response to our situation in the West Kootenays. We are on the firing line on this subject right now. First I would like to say that the thing which restricts our freedom more than anything else is our own restricted imagination and sometimes lack of courage in creating a new form in the face of the "cake of custom". I am appalled by the amount of energy and effort that is required in the area of innovation. And I wish - how often I wish - since we are now creating an instant college and will never again have the same degree of freedom, the same degree of opportunity we presently have, that I, as one associated in a humble way in the development of our enterprise, had a greater degree of imagination, a broader experience and more courage to put ideas into action. I think we have a community in our area and in other places too (and I am sure this is so in Ontario) that would listen with enthusiasm to someone with the courage to promulgate new curricula to meet a new age, to speak a new language. But so many of us when we come to a college come with our bags packed with our old ideas. We think we are coming to a new institution. We think we are creating a new institution. And I thought so too. But when I opened my bags and put out that paraphernalia of ideas on the shelves of the office I found that they are old ideas. In many ways we are pouring old notions into what could be a new form. That is a theoretical observation.

Secondly, I ought to say that we had two large seminars in which the community helped to instruct us and we have had two elections or referenda in which the community voted and these are very powerful ways in which the community is involved in determining curricula and freedom. Have we satisfied this important discussion on freedom before we move on? Freedom exists in its constant defence and in its constant restatement, doesn't it?

MR. PETER BARGEN, Superintendent of Schools, Edmonton.

We ranged over all the questions thrown out at the beginning of this session. One we want to concentrate on for a minute is something that we, at our table at least, found a bit confusing. It is a matter of terminology which we may think we have already resolved. But one thing that struck our fancy was that the term "open door policy" has been used quite extensively at this conference and yet on the basis of the discussion this morning we as a table felt that this may have been lip-service only. Maybe the door is a bit ajar and we allow the university transfer, the university preparatory students through. Now are we serious in adopting the idea of "open door" policy as part of the concept of community colleges? And if this is so how are we going to get this downward extension to the 80% of the people that will be involved in the rest of the space that this "door" implies. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the question is directed to you because you have talked about your college. We have the brochure. It has a very good introduction, but somehow we feel it is inconsistent with what follows in relation to this question of open door. Would you care to comment?

CHAIRMAN:

Yes, I think it was St. Paul who said: What I would, I do not, and what I would not, that I do. It is a very difficult thing to put into operation the principle of the "open door", to have a consistent philosophy and carry with one in a consistent philosophy a faculty, and a community, a university and a high school which one articulates. It is not an easy question. There are all kinds of implications. First of all I would like to ask Bert Wales in his situation to comment on the "open door" because his door is a good deal more "open" than ours is for understandable regional differences.

DR. WALES:

I think you spelt out very nicely the problems of accommodating the wishes and aspirations of so many different groups. We have an "open door" policy which I think I will say is in spite of the government. The government's definition is "Post grade 12". Our board in 1962 or 1963 decided that it must do something about the adults who had very little formal education and who now wanted to complete their high school. And we were told to establish an adult high school. We were amazed at the numbers who came back, and we were determined to continue this as a part of the total college service, to have an "open door". During the past year we have had 456 persons attending in the daytime on a full time basis in our adult high school. These are persons working at the senior levels of the secondary school system. We do not give anything below grade 10 officially, although we have a standing offer to take anybody and put him in a private special tutorial class and bring him up to a level where he can start at that type of program. That is the day program.

This fall we are integrating the evening high school program into that so that it will be part of a college preparatory service as part of our "open door" college. We had 25,000 last year in our night school program on the same basis. Our main problem here has been the curriculum and we now see hopes that the provincial government will accept and recognize a program offered by the college on a credit basis as a suitable program for adults. We are having particular success in the English and Social Study fields which for many adults are the most frustrating.

CHAIRMAN:

To answer your question as far as it concerns Selkirk College, I would like to repeat a paragraph that we wrote about this which is all that can be said at the present time without going into the fine print of subject requirements and such. "The requirement of the College for admission is graduation from High School. While all may enter, not all may stay. The "open door" policy permits ease of access. The door will be closed, however, on students who do not achieve satisfactory grades. Every student will be offered an opportunity to succeed. With individual counselling and good instruction, the College intends that its students will be outstanding successes when they begin their studies in a university."

This is a complicated matter and it is more complicated than when I wrote those words. For example, there are students who are presently saying in the high school: "We don't have to do very well on our examinations. I don't have to work. We can always go to the college. They will take anybody." We have had to make certain restrictions to prevent that development in the high school and this is a serious question.

QUESTION:

Could I follow this with perhaps a statement, but also a question. Those of us who have not developed the community college in the way it is developing in Ontario, or in the way British Columbia is adopting, what guide do we have to the concept for which we should be striving. Should it be "open door" in the sense that the answer has been given, or should it be open door in the sense that every adult person who is able to walk and talk should find something in this institution to help him up-grade or improve his personal, social, educational or economic skills? Or is this too idealistic?

CHAIRMAN:

Not for me. It is our goal. But there are a variety of programs, there are a variety of admissions, there are a variety of levels which can appeal. I hope that we will be able to accommodate everybody who comes to our door for one thing or another. But we cannot accommodate them, nor do we want to, in our academic program, nor indeed in our technological program. There are two other programs - a college preparatory program and an evening program. There may be even a basic second language for new Canadians. So in those four or five programs there is a variety of opportunities that the college can provide, a variety of needs it can serve within our particular community. I know this is true of Dr. Wales as well.

QUESTION:

This is fine, but when we talk of transfer courses in the academic programs we are still dealing only with the 20%. What about the 80%? This is the big question. Perhaps we are not emphasizing this enough. And perhaps also I raised the question because I come from a particular background. We have junior colleges in Alberta which are highly university-oriented and they are going to get in the same straight-jacket that the universities are already in.

DR. ALAN THOMAS, Director, CAAE:

I cannot contribute anything to this except the same concern that other people have. It seems to me that what we are discussing at the moment is the fundamental moral quality of the society. If education has achieved the kind of stature and power that it appears to have achieved, and if it is so that you cannot really survive in the society without access to the opportunity to change yourself, this seems to me implies free will on your side, but also the fact that there are some implacable circumstances that you cannot pretend are not there. It seems to me that the evolution of our concern for poverty, which has emerged from the multi-problem city study that has been done over the last 15 years, has indicated to us that our present method of selection which took place in the existing educational institutions was too restrictive. That is we were over-selecting, and we found ourselves with increasing numbers of citizens who seemed to be unable to cope. In my view the political wisdom of the groups that have pushed wars on poverty and anti-poverty programs of this sort lies in the fact that you cannot have large numbers of citizens of a state who exist within the political system but outside the economic one. These are the seeds of revolution no matter how tidy and how stable and conservative your society may be. A multiplicity of institutions should mean a total "open door" policy within the society. Not that anyone can get into any institution, but that there is no one who cannot find some institution in which he can receive the kind of response which enables him to take the steps sideways, upwards, or whichever way he wants to go.

If we do not have this kind of policy then we are going to fall into the old trap. The community college - in my own feeling - is the hopeful new innovation. But it is possible that it is not going to meet all these needs. Some one said, I think Norman Sisco, that the community college may evolve in different places and in different ways, perhaps in a way in which it itself becomes selective, and we will have to invent another institution. As an educational response to a changing society, I do not see why we should not accept the fact that we are going to go on inventing institutions. And it seems to me the "open door" policy is a total one, but one which involves a variety of institutions to which people have access.

MR. STUART TWEEDIE, Director of Extension, University of Manitoba:

I would like to direct attention to a particular segment in this 80% of our population to which continuous reference has been made. That is the increasing portion thereof who used to be called senior citizens. We now no longer attach that title to them, but I think we should bear in mind that an increasing segment of our community is in the age bracket 65 plus. My suggestion is not that community colleges should provide a playground for the older citizen, but my suggestion is most definitely that the community colleges have a responsibility to assist in the preparation of the older citizen in order that he may move with some dignity and self-satisfaction into a period of retirement which is now, and in the future going to be considerably longer than was hitherto the case. It is my belief that if those responsible for the development of community colleges consciously or unconsciously remain as relatively youth-oriented as has been demonstrated by the discussion today so far, then these colleges will find that they command a rapidly decreasing measure of public support. And I need hardly point out the difficulties that would then arise.

DEAN SMITH:

In a sense the second question from table 8 ties into some of the points which have been raised in recent discussion and it goes back to the matter of the 'portion' which has been discussed so many times. This morning, rather heatedly, somebody suggested that something like 5% of the students in community colleges might be going on to university. We have heard reference just now to 20%. The question really is what proportion of the students in community colleges are going to be in vocational, technical or other programs and what proportion in the university transfer programs. We know now that in the United States, according to Dr. Medsker's book, about two-thirds of the students in junior colleges or community colleges across the United States, not just in California, are in university transfer programs because of the current pressure. You have heard about the situation in Alberta at great length. You have not heard me say that I deplore it just as much as Dr. Andrew Stewart or anybody else. I deplore the fact that the last three junior colleges in Alberta, at the request of their own communities, are offering only university transfer programs. However, the question is not what it is now, but what is it really going to be, what is really the proportion of the students in junior colleges who are going to be university transfer students? In other words how big is the 'dog' and how big is its tail, and in a sense why should Ontario cut the tail off, if, in fact, this is what they are proposing to do?

MR. SISCO:

Well this is getting to a 'yes you are' - 'no you are not' kind of an argument. I can assure you that when I referred to 5% I did not do it heatedly, I did it coldly and deliberately. I do not really think that, if the university desires to continue its very important role as guardian of knowledge and research, you can force 40%, 50%, 60%, or 70% of the population through the narrow end of this funnel, All of us who are sitting here today are here in a sense standing on the backs of thousands and thousands of people who are making a real contribution in producing a national wealth that is making Canada great. I do not think that there are very many people here who do one damn thing directly to swell the gross national product. And I do not really think that Ontario has cut the tail off in this sense when it is admittedly designing a post-secondary system for the 80% of people who, while they certainly have a great deal of intelligence, are not suited to the theoretical, abstract discipline-oriented university-type of education. And I do not think that the alternative is necessarily a vocational technical education. I think that there is a tremendous area in the middle of useful, broad, general, education with applications, the type of education that is related to life, is related to human problems, is related to living and is related to a better adaptation to society in an era of change, but is quite different from the normal university subject-directed approach. I think that the 80% are worthy of a great deal of consideration and I make no apologies for the program at all.

QUESTION:

There is the question of the adult student. He is going to be there if he wants technical or post-secondary technical education, or a transfer program to university, or a post-secondary academic education, but are you going to have non-credit types of education which will prepare someone for living and not for a job and not for a transfer to university - all kinds of courses which do not exist in universities, do not exist in high school?

MR. SISCO:

Well this is what I have been trying to say all day. We are not going to have one damn credit course under a College of Applied Arts and Technology legislation. It is all going to be general education for adults or anybody else. Any university transfer program is going to be operated by the university, for the university and by university staff, and credit courses are one thing which we are not concerned about.

DR. GARNET PAGE, Engineering Institute of Canada:

If there is to be the degree of autonomy which we have been led to believe will be given to Boards of Governors of the community colleges, and if it is in fact true that the present institute of technology type programs will be carried on in community colleges, what steps are being taken provincially within the Department of Education to ensure that the requirements for continued federal financial aid under the federal-provincial agreements will be met. Is there a consideration being given to this so we won't have a foul upset which we had a little while ago in a certain province - not Ontario.

MR. SISCO:

That is a very good question, Dr. Page, and I am glad that you asked it as a counter-balance to the questions I have been asked about complete freedom. And this is partly why my Branch of the Department of Education is the administrative arm of the Council of Regents. Now despite all that I have said about autonomy of the Boards of Governors and so on, we foresee as I have said a provincial program based on a certificate signed by the Minister which must have approval from his officials, and in the institute of technology programs, the engineering technology, in the technician programs, in the sandwich courses for the Department of Labour, in some of the business courses, we feel that a minimum provincial standard must be met. We have an administrator and supervisor of curriculum who has a staff and whose responsibility it is to sit down with advisory committees, and with the staffs of various colleges, to develop minimum criteria for these certifiable areas at a provincial level and to ensure that the colleges meet these standards. Otherwise they will not be getting provincial support.

SUMMARY

DR. J. LOUBSER - University of Toronto

When I said that I was a novice, what I really meant was that today was a learning experience for me and the first thing I want to say is to thank you for that experience in adult education. What I will try to give you here will be the responses of a student of very recent vintage who did not have much time to contemplate the experiences that he had. You will not question the frankness of my remarks because I was genuinely impressed with the general tone and calibre of the proceedings here today. I think that you can congratulate yourselves because many conferences beat about the bush and never get to discussing the real issues. What I found was, from the Minister's address this morning and the panel discussion afterwards, concern focused on the relations of a community college, or whatever the term is you prefer to use, to other institutions in society, to the local community, to the society as a whole, to other educational institutions, particularly the high schools and the universities, to commerce and industries, and the various needs that are felt to exist within the community to which this particular form of educational institution is supposed to be a response to. I find myself very much in a position of having to do little more than summarize here because many people have in their questions brought up the theme that I have noticed running through this conference. I think there could have been more concern with what the community college is all about, what conception do we really have, where does it really go, what does it try to do in the community. Now this is a tremendously complex issue, of course, and perhaps yesterday, when I was not here, you talked the whole day about it. You may already have some idea of the many things the community college will be trying to do in the society. Today's focus on the relationships of the community college to other institutions, and to the society as a whole, is perhaps a healthy balance to what you discussed yesterday. Maybe my concern is simply a reflection of my sensitivities as a sociologist, one who is inclined to look at the relations among people and institutions rather than at the thing itself.

But in this general area of the relations of the community college to other institutions, to government, to local community and to academic institutions, I think that the issues have been defined very often as 'either' or 'or' questions; either an open door or a relatively clear-cut and consistent policy of selectivity; either the democracy involved in local support for colleges; or central government planning and control; either full student participation or none; freedom in planning, or control by boards of directors, boards of government and so forth. I think this is bound to be a somewhat over-simplified version of what in actuality one would expect to find. And that more often than not, it will be a matter not of 'either' or 'or', but of "both". And especially with respect to the matter of freedom and control, Mr. Sisco had a very hard time to try to make his point that central control and regulation does not inevitably mean a lack of democracy or the lack of freedom for people to participate in whatever is being done.

Now from my particular background as a South African, with my primary educational experience in South Africa, I was relatively surprised to find myself on the whole in tune with what you have been discussing.

I do not know whether I have been brain-washed and socialized and indoctrinated by North American society in so many ways that I cannot distinguish any more between what is South African and what is not. On the whole, I responded to this concern with adult education and with trying to create an institutional sphere for people who fall between the terminating aims of the high school system on the one hand, and the higher and more ethereal and more ivory-tower concerns of the university. But what was refreshing to me here was the quality of this concern for creating opportunities for everyone in society to learn, to change to the extent that he desires to change, in response to the rapid changes that are going on around him in society. And this is refreshing, mainly because the situation from which I come is slightly more regimented. I think I should eliminate that word "slightly"; at this stage it is tremendously more regimented. It thinks of people much more in terms of categories. It cannot create a range of opportunities for people on the basis of performance standards, but it operates on the basis of some described status they have in society, according to race or colour or what have you. Now I am not unrealistic enough to say that Canada is entirely free of this, but I was very pleasantly struck by the fact that these concerns were entirely absent from your discussions. I presume that even if you had considered the position of an Indian in this whole scheme you would have applied the same sort of standards.

Let me say finally that I very much liked the concern with the "open door" policy and with creating a balance of institutions that can keep it as widely open as possible, and at the same time maintain the standards appropriate to each institution's function. I very much liked the idea of the freedom of staff and students to participate in planning and the community control in whatever institutions are created. But I also liked the emphasis - and I think that it is much more realistic - on the need for central direction in creating a whole new set of institutions that would respond to the needs of the society. I liked the idea of creating a potential of mobility. What we are concerned with here is to try to enable people to be as mobile as possible, and I feel that we face two conflicting tendencies. On the one hand the emphasis is on giving people an opportunity to learn, and on the other hand, there is a tendency to say, let's make this learning as specific as possible to community needs, to the requirements of business and industry. I would not under-estimate the importance of that issue, I think it is something that will plague us for generations.

I read the White Paper of the Association today for the first time. I was struck by this concern with providing opportunities for people to learn, to change in response to the changes in society. I think the other important thing, which is perhaps less salient there but needs to my mind similar emphasis, is the need for institutional flexibility to create institutions that themselves will have the capacity to change continuously in response to the changing demands, not only of the more immediate community which they are founded to serve but of the larger society. And it was refreshing to find an awareness here of the problem of our human condition as, what we call, symbol-using animals. We create ideas and they become our stock-in-trade in thinking about education or any part of life, and we so often get stuck with them. As Mr. Campbell said: "We try to found a new institution and we commonly find we have a bagful of old ideas".

TEACHERS AND TEACHING

PANEL DISCUSSION: DR. ALAN THOMAS, PANEL CHAIRMAN

It is inevitable that we should approach innovation, as Gordon Campbell said, with a suitcase full of existing or old ideas. It is inevitable, necessary and proper that we should approach it with expectations, habits - both of mind and practice - drawn from our present experience in education. It is I think possible, that is it seems to me in most of our discussions so far, we have tended only to look at different patterns of educational administration and planning in our concern for community colleges. It strikes me that it might be very important for us to look outside of education altogether for administrative models.

If we come with any sets of expectations, perhaps the ones we hold most deeply are those that we hold with respect to teaching and to teachers. It is inevitable that each of us confronts the evolution of this institution with perhaps an almost unexamined set of assumptions about what a teacher is, and what teaching is or should be in these institutions. A great deal of what we said yesterday and the day before presumably came from assumptions made about this, and whether we are going to change them or not, it seems to me important that we should know what kind of assumption we are approaching this educational adventure with. All of you know that there are a number of models of teaching, both predominant, in the contemporary society, and historical in the sense that we remember them without maximizing them or seeking them out at the present time. And let me review just some of them as I see them. The panel members may not accept them in this way and it is probably a good thing if they do not.

One of course is the university model, a model in conflict at the moment within the institution itself. A model which puts the teacher and the researcher into a common bundle, a model which includes a view that participation in research makes the teaching effective and that somehow these two functions must be joined - the model which was drawn from one of the historical institutions that have gone into the contemporary Canadian university. One important aspect of this is that, at least in theory, the subject is not taught unless there is a competent man to teach. Now this is, in my view, a very important distinction. It does not always work that way but at least certainly at the graduate level, and still in some parts of undergraduate work, unless there is an able man one does not offer the subject.

The second major dominant image of the teacher, of course, is the public school, the secondary school teacher, a person who is responsible for carrying out a pre-determined set of studies or presentations. He may be involved in the development of that course of studies or he may not be. But he is a unit and a relatively interchangeable one in a widely spread, generally uniformally administered system for the education of, if you like, compulsory students. One of the important aspects of this and there are many, is that in this case the school is opened and the course is offered whether there is a competent teacher or not. To my knowledge we do not, and have not for some 70 years, closed a school in Canada because there were no teachers for it. That is, no fully-trained teachers. We open the school, provide the children and the books, and the administration and then we find a teacher and hope we can train that teacher along the way. This is another model it seems to me of teaching within a concept of education.

A third model is one that has grown slowly not always in the public eye and this is the teacher who has been teaching in the growing vocational and technical program. In this case an intensely practical man for whom, if you like, vocational experience substitutes for research and in whom an important contact with the practice of a craft or vocation is regarded as indispensable to his ability to convey that skill or vocation to his students. Again let me be quick to say that these are not exhaustive, merely suggestions about some of the characteristics of the models that we approach this situation with.

Finally there is an older historical notion of teacher and there is in this concept a problem which has always created a certain diffidence and ambivalence in the field from which I come, which is adult education. Adult education has never been very comfortable with the word teacher. If you look at the literature you will find that the word leader is as often used. And this is partly because there is a mixture of concept im which the notion of the teacher in the prophetic sense Gandhi, Mohammed, Christ, the great reformers, who were called teachers, in which teaching is completely individual and inescapable from a way of life and a form of action, is mixed with the notion of teaching as the conveying of skills, of understanding, of disciplined activities. And all through the history of adult education you can find a mixture of these two concepts. I introduce this because both Dr. Medsker and Dr. Montague raised issues which we did not discuss at all yesterday and that was the notion of the community college as itself engaged in social change, as an institution which because it has dropped the notion of preparation becomes involved in social change. And Dr. Montague followed this by asking a very important question about what kind of life a teacher leads in that kind of institution under that kind of circumstance, and you will remember that the model he introduced was Socrates and the hemlock cocktail. Well these, it seems to me, are part of the environment, the context of discussion today.

I would like to introduce now the panel members and I am going to ask them very quickly in one or two minutes to say what model of teacher they have in mind, or what model of teaching they have in mind for the community college. Then I am going to ask each one of them to expand on the kinds of issues that the development of a teaching staff and of a particular kind of teaching staff raises. Now let me first introduce them.

A man you have already met, Professor Edward J. Monahan, from the Canadian Association of University Teachers; Dr. Robin Harris, Dean of Innis College at the University of Toronto and for four years a member of the Toronto Board of Education; Robert Gwilliam, of the Training Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, soon to be the Manpower Department; and Brick Robb, Secretary of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation.

MR. EDWARD J. MONAHAN:

I am very conscious of the remark which Dr. Page made last evening about prejudices involving people being down on what they are not up on. And I would immediately take issue with the models which Alan has so briefly sketched and suggest that he has presented us with rather an impossible task. It seems to me, and this is one comment I would like to make with respect to the proceedings of the past two days, that the notion of the community college is not a notion at all. It is a series of notions and I do not think that it is capable of being defined in terms of any specific set of objectives. And since it is not capable as a concept of being defined in terms of specific objectives which might be embodied in one institution, I do not think it is possible to describe, either briefly or at length, the kind of teacher who would be the best in this kind of institution. It seems to me that we are making a mistake - I am only suggesting this. We have been talking about the need for community colleges to fill in the gaps in our educational needs in contemporary society. We have talked about the need of flexibility, the need of serving many kinds of people with their particular educational objectives both formal and informal. We have talked about the failure of the formal school system, elementary, secondary, technical, vocational, university. The failure of the system as it is presently constructed to meet the very needs of a large percentage, perhaps the majority of our population. Yet it seems to me we very blindly assume that all of these needs can be met by a new kind of institution. Well it seems to me that we are putting our faith in this new kind of institution which is probably, or should be, many kinds of institutions.

DR. ROBIN HARRIS:

Of the four models you mentioned obviously, in my opinion, we are talking about the third. I notice that in describing the first two, the university teacher and the school teacher, you had no difficulty in talking at great length and anybody in this room could probably write quite a long essay on how university teachers are trained and how they are not trained, and how school teachers are trained or not trained. But I also noticed that when you came to talk about the training of this practically-oriented teacher you quickly slid into the fourth category. In other words that is the one that is not defined and that is the one that as far as I am concerned has to be defined. I am not particularly impressed by the fourth model you cite. You are really talking about the mystic, the poet, the seer, who because of the quality of his thought and spirit and his innate capacity to communicate this, happens also to be a person who does communicate in a telling fashion. But one thing I know from history is that you cannot train poets, you cannot train seers, and you cannot train mystics, so I think it is a muddy ground, it sounds very nice but it is highly romantic.

DR. ROBERT GWILLIAM:

The problem, it seems to me, is one of both looking at the supply and demand side. We should be looking at the audience that the community college will be addressing and this I believe should be the adult segment of our community. And the other thing which we should be looking at is the world of work and that is just one aspect I suppose of one's life. The community college I think has a role to play in helping significant numbers of our adult population to fit into the world of work in a more significant way than they are doing at the moment. And the thing which has disturbed me in the last two days is our assumptions about the need to continue our "cream skimming" operation of merely digging a little deeper into that top ten or fifteen percent of the population pool of talent. We are concerned about the people who nearly made the university, who nearly made technical institutions; what about the other 85%? I would just suggest to you very quickly that basically our education system is saying to those people that unless you have a Ph.D. you are a drop-out, and I think that our community colleges should be regarding themselves essentially as training the drop-outs and that includes most of us.

DR. BRICK ROBB:

I find myself under a bit of a handicap in not having been present at the previous sessions so I do not know whether this group has arrived at any consensus at all as to the aims and objectives of the community colleges we are talking about. I think I would like to make this observation that the one thing we cannot do is to define a sort of stereotype of the ideal teacher for this kind of an institution for I do not think there is any such animal. I think we should be thinking in terms of a variety of types of teachers which will be necessary in an institution which has such a diversity of aims and objectives as seem to be the aims and objectives of the community college. I do not think we can say that the community college teacher must have this as opposed to that, or must have this along with that. I think we will have to recognize the fact that there will be many kinds of teachers in this kind of an institution if it is to do an effective piece of work. My observations of course come from a person who is secondary school oriented completely and one of the difficulties the secondary school system has faced has been its unwillingness to accept the fact that there is no formula which can be applied willy-nilly to all persons who are going to teach successfully at the secondary school level. We have to recognize a wide divergence in background qualifications and competence depending on the nature of the teaching job. I think the teaching profession, if you can refer to the teaching profession, suffers from an urge to conformity, a desire to lay down a pattern which will embrace everyone, so that we can all say we are teachers and therefore all alike. And one of the real problems this college is going to have to face is the necessity for teachers - whether they be university teachers, or any one of the four types which Dr. Thomas has mentioned - to learn how to work side by side as confreres, rubbing shoulders with people whose background, experience and so called qualifications are vastly different from their own. I do not think you can define a stereotype of the ideal teacher.

CHAIRMAN:

Now I think we will give our panelists a chance to bite more deeply into the topic and to raise and comment on a variety of kinds of issues which face us whether or not we can agree upon a single model or a series of models of teachers and teaching in these new institutions. Some of the issues that were raised in a preliminary round yesterday were problems of where are we going to find teachers for the institutions we are now opening. I am sorry that Gordon Campbell is not still here for one of the things he told us yesterday was that he had about 1,500 applications for 32 positions at Selkirk College, and that he had been surprised by this number of responses when he had approached the problem with the expectation that it would be very difficult to even get the initial enquiries. There are other issues such as the pre-and in-service training that will be necessary for the evolution of these institutions, which will be largely in the hands of the teaching staff presumably. It seemed to me very clear yesterday from Mr. Fisher, who indicated that as a student the persistent and most telling impact he had with the college was through the instructors and the relationship he had with those instructors, that this is where the quality of life in the institution presumably is contained. So let's go back again and give our panelists a chance to move further into this subject and deal with some of the questions that seem to them to be uppermost in their minds.

DR. MONAHAN:

There are two points which I would like to make, one directly concerned with the matter of the role of the teacher in the institution. Now here I would admit very freely and immediately my own prejudices as a member of the Canadian Association of University Teachers which is currently very interested in pushing faculty participation in university government. But apropos of the remarks that Mr. Fisher made yesterday and the other remarks having to do with the role of students in these institutions with specific reference to curriculum planning and other essential aspects of the institution, my impression was that remarkably too little awareness was shown of what in my mind is absolutely essential - namely the establishment of some structure within the institution, whatever curricular programs it develops, which will actively engage student representatives and a teaching staff on the continuous planning and revision of curricula. I think that Mr. Beauregard's summary of the plans in the province of Quebec are much in advance of the thinking on this subject which was represented by other parties in the discussion and I could not emphasize too much my own conviction that the teachers and the students have to be given a place in the institution for continuous contributions in this area.

The second comment I want to make involves what we term as the in-service training of teachers. We have very frequently mentioned in the last couple of days the need for new programs of study in these institutions, the rapidly increasing development of knowledge and technology. It seems to me that at all levels of our educational system from the elementary right on through, we have totally inadequate provisions for the continuous re-training of teachers. The concept of sabbatical leave in the university is far from commonly accepted. A year off after seven, this is considered to be a luxury. When you get down to the elementary and secondary school systems, by and large we seem to provide for in-service training of teachers by the carrot of a few more dollars if you get an academic degree by one and two-day weekend institutes. But this is really not enough by half, and it seems to me that one of the things we must do in our educational system and certainly in our new types of institutions, is to set up, to build in as carefully as we can, provisions for the continuous in-service training of teachers. Whether it be six months off from teaching every two years or three years, whether it be two months off every year, this can be worked out and should be worked out, but I really think we should provide this very much more adequately.

MR. ROBB:

Well I think I agree very much with the last speaker. I think that this is one of the problems to be faced in considering teaching staff for the new community college. However, the longer I am in this game, and I have been in it too long now I am afraid, the more I am conscious of the fact that about all we can do is to see problems and hope that somebody else is going to be able to find the answers. The problems are not too difficult to see and I think that one of the real ones in connection with the community college follows along the line of what I said earlier. After all, a person is educated in an institution and what I am trying to say here is that the teacher does not work in isolation. Each student who attends one of the institutions is subjected to a number of teqchers and if he is to get what seems to me to be an education, it is imperative that the teaching staff be more than a collection of individuals, each working on the student in the a[illegible]f his own particular discipline and from his own particular philosoph[illegible]hat I am really trying to say is that the staff of an institution has to develop a kind of esprit de corps and become in sense a team in which each recognizes the part which the other has to play in the educative process. This has become difficult in secondary schools with the introduction of a much broader base for secondary education and the necessity of bringing into the schools, the people who, I have said earlier, have a background of training quite different from the traditional academic teacher. How these people are to work side by side to share a community of interest, to share a common objective and to pool their resources rather than working at logger heads, is a real problem. And to bring it down to a very mundane level, perhaps it's not so mundane, how do you decide on an issue like salaries to be paid? The honour graduate in mathematics who is teaching a strictly or largely academic program, vis-a-vis the highly practical individual with the background of industry who is teaching only on a part-time basis and whose approach is practical rather than theoretical. How do you equate these two people if you label them both as teachers? How do you have them each recognize the importance of the other in the over-all picture and each recognize their function as a member of the team? It seems to me that the person who tries to administer a college with this kind of heterogeneous teaching staff is going to have a real problem in developing this esprit de corps which I think is essential, this sense of a teaching team rather than a collection of individuals each labouring away in their own manner and own discipline.

Now this kind of team development can, of course, be pursued along a great many other lines. How do you equate working load, for example? The person who spends most of his time in the classroom, vis-a-vis the person who spends little time in the classroom and much time in familiarizing himself with new developments which he will have to do to keep up with the technological and technical branches of the institution. These are problems as I see them. I have no particular answers to them and this is why I said earlier that I do not think you can define a stereotype. I think you have to recognize that there are many kinds of teachers. Perhaps the problem of integrating these variations into a cohesive staff whole could be in part overcome if we started off with a variety of designations and got away from the traditional practice of labelling everyone on the staff as a teacher or a professor or whatever title you may use, and recognized initially that there are a variety of functions here and therefore there should be a variety of labels. Perhaps the economic value of one group vis-a-vis another group will be different in terms of salary to be paid; perhaps they will be different in terms of work load. I do not know the answer but I am suggesting that labelling them all teachers is going to increase the problem of creating this esprit de corps rather than decreasing it.

I have sometimes said that we could have a completely harmonious staff in any educational institution if we could only devise a method of paying them whereby every teacher got at least $100 more per year than every other teacher. This would solve all our problems, but to date we have not been able to deduce this kind of a situation. I also agree that this need for in-service training is going to be very, very important in the community college, but the degree of importance again is going to vary depending on the nature of the work the teacher is doing. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I can come up with any answers but I am suggesting that there are real problems in this area.

DR. HARRIS:

While I agree with Mr. Robb that there will have to be many different kinds of teachers in this new institution, I think this is a separate area. I think there are, in some respects, differences between the university on the one side and the secondary and public school on the other. I think there has to be a common base. But we are talking about a third area and not simply an expansion of either of the traditional two. The community college is first of all a post-secondary institution and therefore it is different from the public and secondary school in the fact that the teacher can assume motivation, there is no question or ought not to be, of discipline. There is not the necessity of giving something to students who do not know what they need and must in a sense be directed. At the College of Applied Arts and Technology, if it is a question of re-training, or whether it is a form of adult education, whether you admit students with a grade 10 standing but on the sort of basis that the university admits the mature student because he is 25 years old and doesn't insist on the entrance requirements of the students coming fresh from high school - you are still assuming motivation and the teacher's role has to be based on that. And this suggests to me that the kind of training that the community college teacher has will be a different one than that appropriate for the elementary or the secondary school teacher.

On the other side it is a post-secondary institution but it is not a university and therefore it has a practical orientation rather than a theoretical orientation and therefore there should be no requirement for research in the preparation of the teacher. That is to say, one should not require the teacher in the community college to demonstrate a capacity for research or to let research or capacity for it have anything to do with his initial appointment, his promotion or the firing of him.

Secondly, I think there has to be a common base. Of the secondary and elementary school teacher we actually require or will be in the process of requiring over the next 5, 10 or 15 years, a B.A. or first degree. We require university teachers to have a B.A. and then to go on to something more, an M.A. or Ph.D. We require the secondary school teacher to have a B.A. and then to go on to take teacher training for a period of time. We are in the process of requiring the elementary school teacher to do essentially the same thing, to have a B.A. plus some direct preparation for the work they will do in the school. I think it follows that the general requirement, the thing that would be required of all teachers in the community college would also be a B.A. as a starting point - or the kind of academic training in the general education field which places the person in the position where he can give the kind of counsel and advice already suggested by one of the other members of the panel. So then I think it is a question of thinking in terms of a basic academic training to the first degree level plus, and where this area will differ from both the university teaching and secondary-elementary school teaching is in what that plus will be.

Thirdly, I would like to say something about the problem of supply. I do not believe there really is in the long run a problem of finding enough teachers for the community colleges or indeed for any of our schools. I think that the way society is increasingly working most people are in the business of teaching. I suspect that if one made a job analysis of what the manager of this hotel does, one would find that a considerable proportion of his time is involved in teaching. That is to say conveying information and persuading people that something should be done or learned .. and of getting people to apply their minds in a particular direction. I think this is what most of the people in all these buildings around here do. The insurance firms, Eaton's and Simpson's, the executive type person even at the junior executive level is very normally performing a teaching function. I think this is natural to man as a sort of social animal. Since we are all teachers here I assume, we all know what excitement there is in teaching and it should not therefore surprise us to find that this kind of excitement can operate for large numbers of people. I think perhaps 50% of the people in Canada, perhaps 75% are potential teachers in some direction and I think it is a question then of finding them and of directing them to it.

I think back to my own experience as an undergraduate. I went to university with the intention of being a lawyer. I had never thought of teaching at all. A series of accidents happened, accidents in the sense that I happened to have been in a particular room that I might very well never have been in, and somebody else happened to be in that room, and as a result of this kind of thing, I became a teacher. But it was an accident. If the accident of that particular circumstance had not occurred, I would have been in a law office right now. I think of the other 50 people who were in my particular class, two of whom were going to be teachers, about five of whom have in fact become teachers - one being myself. The three extra ones became teachers because some accident happened. This was, of course, in the depression when one was not being urged to become a teacher. But as I look at my classmates, and it just happens. it is 25 years ago this week, and we are all going out for a reunion in two days time, as I look at those people, I would say a third of them who are doctors, lawyers, engineers, or whatever, would have been as happy and probably happier as teachers.

I suggested that a first degree ought to be the basic requirement, the factor common to most community college teachers. I recognize that there will be exceptions for particular areas of instruction, but on the whole a basic requirement. Between 1960 and 1970, the Ontario undergraduate enrollment, the first degree enrollment in the Ontario universities is moving from 30,000 to 110,000, it is tripling and this is happening across the board. But the great bulk of the increase and the rising increase is in Arts and Science in the general first degree. There are increases in engineering and medicine but the great bulk is in arts and science. They are going to be B.A.'s and B.Sc.'s, and most of them in a general course rather than an honours course. And the same thing will happen in the 1970's. The undergraduate enrollment will certainly double and you will have a continual supply of people with a first degree. Now what are they going to do? What exactly is the general B.A. going to do? Well, my guess is that in the majority of instances, they are going to become teachers. So that I think there is the supply we need. The problem is to attract those people, to create the accident, if you like, to turn them in the direction of teaching. Secondly, to create the conditions within the profession in each type of institution that will encourage them to actually go into it. I think one of the conditions is the way you get the actual direct preparation for teaching. The problem is to identify them, to give them the opportunity and then create the conditions which will make this the rich experience which it can obviously be.

CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Dr. Harris. And I am reminded by your own career of a comment that Ned Corbett once made. He started life as a clergyman and he became director of CAAE, and he once pointed out that he had started out on the Road to Damascus and fallen amongst educators.

DR. GWILLIAM:

I agree with some of the things Dr. Harris said. However, I am not very happy about his assumptions of the role of the community college. Indeed, I think one of its functions may be a post-secondary function, but I do not think this could possibly be its primary function. Perhaps I ought to back up and tell you some of the things I have in mind, that influence my thinking in this. If one looks at the current Canadian labour force which consists of 6½ million of us and realizes that the average number of years of schooling which we have is about 9½, this means that about half our labour force has not any high school at all. The people that we find having difficulties in surviving in the world of work, and indeed in living, are people who have had very little in the way of schooling. I myself have met many, many people who have barely been to school at all, and I think the community colleges must face up to helping some one or two million people who are presently in the labour force and help them to survive in the changing world of work. This is not to say that I neglect the youth and the children. It is obviously a good long-range economic bet to put your dollar on the young person for the future. But let us not fail ultimately by sowing the seeds of revolution which we may well be doing by neglecting several million adults by concentrating our community college efforts only on those most likely to have a grade 10 or 12 level. This is going to be a very small number of people.

Now if my suggestion is right that someone should regard the community college as being concerned with this large group of people who have really no secondary school "education", then this presents some new problems for the adult educator. He has to find ways of bringing along in the educational sense, in the training sense, people who are illiterate, people who can barely read or write. They have basic problems of communication. This I think is a monumental challenge for people. We have some examples in Canada, some institutions, shall I say, in which we have first class people attempting to do this very thing. Indeed, I think there are even some university extension departments vitally concerned with this. This is the area I would like to see expanded. This is the area I would like to see us concentrate upon.

Now the problem that we should really be discussing today, the teaching problem. I would just like to make a few remarks. Perhaps, we should regard teaching no longer as a long-range career profession, but perhaps one of the things which many of us do in the course of our lives. Maybe we could regard teaching as a five or ten year stint for many of us. I think most of us have it in us to do some teaching, at some level, for some period of time. This is rather a generalized statement but I think this is possible. And perhaps in our community colleges we may reshape our thinking in terms of perhaps having a core of staff concerned primarily with being sensitive to the needs of the community, and perhaps a group of people who continually come in under contract and then go back in the world of work and continue in their other careers.

CHAIRMAN:

Well there you have at least the opening round of an issue as crucial as any that the development of a new institution faces. It seems to me that a number of interesting threads have appeared in all the presentations of the panelists. It is difficult in the evolution and in the development of a new enterprise not to define its basic functions in terms of what they should not be rather than in terms of what they should be. Perhaps it is healthy that we should do that, because we do not really know the answer to this question until we have seen it in operation and tried a number of different approaches to it. One of the specific themes throughout it seems to me is a useful formulation which has been very hopeful in other professions, I am thinking particularly of medicine and its associated professions. All the panelists have in one way or another suggested that we think about teaching rather than about teachers. Ask ourselves what kinds of teaching functions we have to fullfill and then begin to grapple with what kind of people, under what kinds of circumstances can best fulfill them, rather than identifying a group of people called teachers and then trying to deploy them so that they can fulfill the teaching function. This I think fits with the general proposal made by Dr. Stewart on Monday that we should think in terms of functions and then group our resources, physical and human, around the performance of those functions. This may mean decisions about part and full-time teachers which I think I found clearly suggested at least in two of the panelists' presentations. It included very valuable suggestions from Mr. Robb about the fact that there will be a variety of styles of teaching in any one of these institutions, that not only should we resist the tendency to conform to a single central notion of what a teacher is, but we shall have to if these institutions are to succeed. I liked particularly both Professor Monahan's concern about in-service training and the necessity of doing it continuously particularly in educational institutions, and Mr. Robb's notion which I think of enormous importance when he argued about an esprit de corps, a sense of participation which is characteristic of all the people in the institution, rather than characteristic of them only in sub-groups. I would draw your attention to the fact that one of the major recommendations in the Keate report on Canadian Broadcasting was the immediate implementation of a massive range of in-service training programs within the CBC, and I would suggest to you that that recommendation is very closely related to everyone's sense of the total lack of an esprit de corps in that organization at the present time. That in-service training and that kind of esprit de corps which Mr. Robb talks about are very intimately and importantly related.

I think Dr. Harris comes very close to the bone in his comments in terms of supplies of teachers, of people able to fulfill these functions, because however the colleges develop, whatever choices we are making ten years from now, some choices have to be made now. And one of the questions which I think becomes of enormous interest to the table is- O.K. What kinds of people are you going to choose now, what kinds of credentials are you going to give weight to? What kinds of criteria will you base your choices on? Will you fall back on present credentials for teaching, will you take the person trained in the teachers' training establishment, will you take the teacher who has had ten years' experience in one or another of our institutions? Will you take people who preferably have not had any experience in teaching institutions because you would rather train them yourself? It seems to me that you have some fairly fundamental issues to look at in your table discussions and then to deal with the panel in the concluding session this morning. Dr. Harris has indicated that there are enough people . One of the enormous concerns since the community colleges became a reality has been that there were not enough, that the college would drain good teachers from other institutions where they are just as badly needed. So that is one thing to look at. Is Dr. Harris essentially right? Is the university degree the essential point of departure? Does this mean that no community college graduate can teach in a community college without having gone to some other institution for some other kind of education? What does this do to the colleges? What can we do, or should we do, about part and full-time teachers and the kinds of administrative problems they present, as well as the kinds of vitality they bring to the life of the faculty or the staff which inevitably communicates itself to the student? Where should these teachers belong?

. . .

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR ARISING FROM GROUP DISCUSSION

MR. CURTIS, Director of Adult Education, Collegiate Institute Board of Ottawa:

Mr. Chairman, our discussion was opened by suggesting that a definition of the teaching function is what we need since we have been at this Conference talking in functional terms, and the definition proposed was "that it is the business of the teacher to create an environment in which learning can take place". Our table likes this definition. It was agreed the worst crime a teacher can commit is to damage the self-image of a learner as a learner. The persuasion of people that they are not very good learners we take to be the cardinal sin of teaching. The question we want to pose follows on the business of saying that in community colleges we simply must have people who are trained to teach adults rather than children. And the question that follows it is: should a teacher for community colleges be in fact certified and if so by whom and on what grounds?

MR. ROBB:

Yes, and by the profession. The teaching profession is that body of persons who are trained and capable of creating an environment in which learning takes place. I think we are fooling ourselves when we assume that there are no standards to be achieved by people who are creating this kind of an environment. I think it is patently clear that if one is to consciously go about the task of creating an environment in which learning takes place it is necessary that the person knows something about how learning does take place and in what kinds of environments it can and cannot take place. So using that as a minimal base, certification might be simply assurance that the person who is being certified has that skill or knowledge. I think those most competent to assess the possession of that skill or knowledge are teachers. I do not think laymen know situations in which learning can take place. Therefore if there are situations in which learning can or cannot take place, somebody has to be in a position of defining what these situations are. And I believe the teaching profession are the people who can do this. This is why I say there should be certification as an indication that the people who are teaching have this basic skill. Secondly the only people who can decide when they have this skill are the members of the teaching profession, whether they be at the elementary or university level.

DR. ROBIN HARRIS: QUESTION TO MR. ROBB -

I'd like to begin by asking Dr. Robb whether, according to his definition, university professors at this juncture are certified - I mean in the spirit of what he is talking about.

MR. ROBB:

I would say some are and some are not. I think that in order to hold a teaching position at any level in the educational system a person should have demonstrated his ability to create the kind of situation that is outlined in our definition of teaching. I am convinced that this can be demonstrated, we all know some people do it and some do not. I am not too concerned whether you have taken this or that course, whether you hold this piece of paper or that. But I am concerned about the fact that some people are able to exercise this skill and when they have demonstrated their ability to do so the profession should place on them the stamp of approval of a teacher.

QUESTION:

How are you going to find out whether or not a teacher can create this situation? Are you going to hire him for one year to see how he works out, may be this is the best way. The very poorest teachers that we get are people who have been teaching children because they are not capable of teaching adults in the large part. They are not able to communicate with adults after a number of years of teaching children. Adult teaching is a whole lot more than that. It is a matter of creating a communication between the teacher and the learner. It is a matter of being involved in the learning situation and if you are going to have teachers who do nothing but preach then we do not want them teaching adults. It seems to me community colleges are just going to be another high school if that is what you are going to have. Some of the best teachers too are not those who have B.A.'s For instance, if you are going to have a barbering course why does the barber have to have a B.A.? All that is necessary is that he knows how to teach people how to cut hair and he is able to communicate with the student.

MR. ROBB:

The essential factor is that he has to be able to communicate with his students and create, as the definition says "the environment where learning takes place". The only basis on which you can assess whether a person possesses this qualification is by some kind of assessment of a practice teaching situation, or a trial and error situation, where the person is in front of a class and is given a chance to demonstrate his skill. This skill is not acquired from books. It is a very complex skill, it involves many factors which are not readily measurable. I do not think a B.A. is a necessary requirement. It is perhaps a desirable requirement, but there are other factors which are more important.

DR. GWILLIAM:

Perhaps I could dodge the question by saying that I have been in about 50/60 of the adult re-training centres geared to the unemployed people mostly. I found quite a heterogeneous group of people engaged in teaching, teaching them to read and write and do other elementary things. I have seen highly successful people who are ex public school teachers, ex high school teachers, ex used-car salesmen, the most astonishing variety of people. The thing they have in common is this empathy with the adult population. I would agree that at some point a man should be given a stamp of approval or at least a mark of merit to say 'thou art a good teacher'. I would like to see this done through an apprenticeship kind of system in which the man or woman is engaged and over a period of time with help and assistance from experienced staff members becomes competent and able and then is given a kind of in-service certificate or diploma. I think there is little to be gained from long periods of so-called teacher education when one is dealing with adults. The empathy is the important thing and all kinds of people have it.

MISS HELEN TRAYNOR, Department of Labour, Ottawa.

Our table found that while it may be necessary in teaching academic subjects to have a B.A., to have a teacher training certificate. But when you come to the question of skills of any kind I think it is more important to have a good knowledge of the skill. It seems to me it would be much easier to teach a person with a skill to become a teacher than to teach an academic teacher to acquire this skill in order to impart it. We wonder if in a Community College it should be the primary requirement to have a B.A. The community college is to serve people, this 80% or 85% of people who need to have a second chance, who need to have something imparted to them that can only be imparted to them at an adult level. It may be that using the idea of community"College"in that phrase, is misleading many people. We automatically get into the track of thinking of post-secondary training, something between the level of the high school and the university. And is that what we really want? Aren't we thinking of the group of people who possibly will never go to university, who have been out in the world of work, who will be looking for additional knowledge, whether it is with credit in view or not, and if we continue to think in the terms of academic learning I think we will be a way off-base. The whole idea really of training at this level is to have something entirely new and somebody stated yesterday "We tend to be taking the old bag of tricks into a new environment".

DR. HARRIS:

I said there would be exceptions. And I suggested that there should be a first degree as the normal starting point qualification. Remember that some professional training comes on, something of an apprenticeship type which is directly related to the work the teacher will carry on in a community college. But I suggested that there should be this common basic qualification for the great majority of the faculty of the community college. I agree with everybody who has spoken before this on the importance of the faculty being themselves involved in the development of the program, and it is this faculty I am talking about. Now I think one reason why something I am calling a first degree level is a basic requirement is that the teacher in a community college must understand the process of teaching, he must understand the kinds of students he is dealing with and the kinds of problems that they are dealing with. And this is the kind of understanding, it seems to me, which one normally associates with the completion of a first degree. They have been through the kind of theoretical considerations which make it easier for them to adapt themselves to this kind of situation. It is for this reason we ought to aim at expecting this faculty to be at least as well qualified in general terms as the faculty of the university, secondary schools and elementary schools. We are not suggesting, are we, that we go back and not have the degrees required for the secondary and elementary school teachers? Surely the work in community colleges is not less demanding?

Are we to put it in the hands of people who have not themselves the theoretical stature or posture for considering the rather complex problems which these students as individuals represent.

MR. DAY, Vancouver City College:

I would like to make some comments on the actual hiring experience at the Vancouver City College. I would like to inform the audience here that Dean Cousins is representing Lethbridge where they have been hiring for nine years. Most of you, it seems to me, are somewhat suspended in the realm of theory. Here are some of the things that have actually taken place at the Vancouver City College. First there have been many hundreds of applications for positions in the Vancouver City College. Many have knocked, but few shall enter, and this has been the circumstance. A profile sheet is not used but I think as time goes on it will be. We are looking for an ascertainable character, looking for personality, and above all else for a personal presence. And having ascertained these things we most certainly want the dog-eared diploma to substantiate his qualifications which would make him eligible to teach in the college. I do not think that the intellectual stature of the junior college teacher would require that he should be in the vanguard of all mental processes. He needs to have a thorough understanding of his discipline. He needs to appreciate the overall social ramifications of many disciplines, that he may be called upon to comment upon in any number of areas directly or indirectly associated with his particular field of interest and teaching. Now with these things in mind the hiring has proceeded at Vancouver City College and I think with some considerable success, because out of 100 teachers hired only 8 this year have decided either through their own initiative, or perhaps at some suggestion from the administration, to go into some other line of work. Two or three of those have returned to the secondary school where they are happier with juvenile, or shall we say less mature minds. A few have gone back into industry and business. So with this kind of hiring record I think the experience of the Vancouver School Board and its officials would demonstrate a tremendous success, and we would hope that the people responsible for the hiring would have the sort of criteria at their fingertips which will continue to make Vancouver City College as prosperous as it has been.

I think faculty organization is tremendously important and I have gathered that throughout Canada generally this area has not been emphasized. I mean to say that in the City College, the faculty has assumed responsibility for professional development. We have been in contact with CAUT, we will be in contact with the B.C Teachers' Federation. We want to situate ourselves in the middle, as it were, to provide the sort of service the community is paying for one way or another. I think that possibly our solution to this matter of grading staff and making distinctions between welders and secretaries, historians and economists is good in as much as we have classified everybody as an instructor, and we hope through continuing exchange with the school board to make some incentive provision for special tasks delegated to individual staff members, in as much as some may be subject chairmen, above that there will be department or division chairmen and possibly a sub-chairman under each of those divisions.

So that we are looking for excellent welders to teach welding and excellent historians to teach history. And the distinction between one segment of a staff and another is not apt to develop under this particular approach. The faculty association itself, in co-operation with the board and its able officials, has been able to bring about a most prosperous circumstance for the college.

DR. THOMAS:

When you referred to the diploma, what kind of diploma did you mean?

MR DAY:

I was thinking along the line of the B.A., the M.A. for the academic work, journeyman certificate for the vocational and perhaps some other kind of certification for the technical, vocational and art work. This diploma is absolutely essential in order to establish the standards we would like to establish, but there are other factors in a teacher's total make-up which have all been mentioned here. But the person doing the hiring must be the judge when you are getting down to the practical situation.

DEAN COUSINS:

Our situation is slightly different from that of Vancouver because in the province of Alberta university education is a monopoly, or has been, of the University of Alberta, and therefore our standards are set by the achievement usually of a M.A. in the subject of specialization, and we have always stuck to this because we think this is a very fair thing. Alberta has a system of vocational high schools and in these they set up a system of teacher certification by means of which they took the journeyman certificate and the experience in industry as one year of teacher training, and then with a system of bursaries, which the provincial government gave them, they were able to take a second year and become qualified as standard certificated teachers after two years. Now in the Junior College Act no mention was made of special provincial certification as teachers. We did hire people who did have teaching certificates as much as possible because, bad as our faculty of education may have been, there is something about the training you get there which at least orients you towards teaching and therefore we thought that was superior to nothing. So wherever possible we have taken these people. But at the beginning of the junior college movement people were not anxious to teach in this unknown area and therefore we were very often obliged to take people who we thought would be good. For instance, in the commercial area we would take people who had a very successful office experience and if possible a teaching certificate for teaching shorthand and typing in the schools and put them right into our college. But the interesting thing is that as soon as we get these teachers in motor mechanics, or in electronics, or radio and television, or sheet metal, they immediately want to up-grade themselves, get their senior matriculation and take advantage of their one year training they are allowed and go onto university to get their standard secondary certificate, because the University of Alberta is so organized that they do have a part of the faculty of education that deals with the certification of vocational teachers. So we have been riding both horses. Now there is no dearth of applications of people who have training in industry, journeyman certificates and teaching certificates as well. The junior college is now arrived. It is a movement and it is a status symbol, so we have no difficulty in applications. But ten years ago there was a great dubiety you might say about the whole thing.

DR. GWILLIAM:

Could you please give us a quick thumb-nail sketch of the characteristics of the students you have in your college in terms of say, age distribution, the sort of entrance qualifications, and the percentage of students that succeed in your terms in relation to those admitted.

DEAN COUSINS:

The standards are set in the vocational section as junior matriculation as far as possible. But when we go into the trades we accept the standards that are set by the apprenticeship board, which may be, say, in welding grade 9, or if a person is an adult over 17 we do not care what they have. We have certain farm programs in which the people take welding and motor mechanics for use on the farm and we do not even enquire. We usually think that students should be at least 17, if they are below the grade 11 standard, but we do have people from the grade 9 level, the grade 10 level and grades 11 and 12, as well as the university students who must have the matriculation or with new regulations slightly below it. We have to use our judgment on that. The experience has been that the lower the qualification the more difficult it is to adjust the student. We have people from the Indian Reserve close by and they are doing quite well, but when two of them went into electronics last year that was a bit too deep for them, so the Indian agent is going to see that they get a better background of the mathematics required before he sends them to us again. But in motor mechanics, in business, in bookkeeping, we have had a great deal of success. In sheet metal particularly - some of them were almost deliquents, but they have become very good sheet metal operators, and they were taken into the industry. The failure rate is not very high, mostly they seem to drop out if they lack interest rather than failing out. Grade 9, I would say, is about as low as our people would go in the college because that is the lowest standard acceptable to the apprenticeship board.

MR. H. E. THOMAS, Youth Branch, Department of Education, Ontario:

Possibly our group may have something to say to the Vancouver City College. The feeling we have is that you tend to perpetuate an institution once you start to do the kinds of things you are describing. We felt that the community college was a process rather than an institution. We are the first to admit that it needs at its core some professional educators, the kinds of people who understand how to do what Bert Curtis talked about. In other words a range in environment. We did not feel that this meant that we had to have the whole range of faculty as permanent parts of the institution. If the community college in essence is a process that can help the community to discover its educational needs, then it needs a few process people who know how to do this and the job then of the core faculty is simply to arrange a succession of environments to meet the community's educational needs. We discussed this, we tested it out in many fields - the up-grading of technicians, up-grading of professionls in the community, and we felt that at the core we needed people who knew how to design an educational climate. And since knowledge is accumulating so quickly, we did not see possibly how a community college could have fixtures on its staff, subject experts. We think this is quite impossible, and that for a great range of courses the subject people will be drawn from an appropriate industry or an appropriate discipline to come into an educational climate which the core process people would help arrange, and incidently where the learners would have helped discover what the needs were. This is the kind of thing we envisage it to be. We are just a little bit afraid that you get a little bit like the dinosaur - he could not adapt - and that is what we find our institutions doing. So we did shake our heads a bit when we heard the Vancouver nice job specs. and the subject experts becoming just a little bit rigid within the system. So I think our contribution at the moment is that the community college as we see it is really a process rather than an institution. It will not have a fixed staff, it will not have fixed qualifications, it will have a core of process educators. It may not even operate all its programs within an institution, it may take them into the community or into a field.

DR. HARRIS:

My reference to the B.A. as a basic requirement perhaps applies to the core people and not to all others, and if that would make people happier I will be happy to revert to that.

The reference made to the bad teacher with the same qualifications as the good teacher and therefore receiving the same salary brings me back to the remarks Mr. Robb was making earlier and the question of certification. And it seems to me certification is sort of permanent, and there it is, the person has the certificate. I would be happier about this kind of arrangement if there were any examples in the history of teachers' federations in this country of the federation withdrawing someone's qualifications because it was proved that, although they were competent in the 1940's, in 1952 they were not. We all talk a great deal about the fact that we have teachers in schools who are 10 years or 20 years out of date, but I do not know of any instance where the federation has stepped in and said, we are sorry but you people who were certified back in the year X are no longer. This seems to me a situation where the universities have the advantage, because there is not any technical certification and the demands of the market apply. If a person proves to be unsatisfactory this is taken into account. I would like the community college to be in the same position where it is not trapped, if you like, by certification that was made permanent at a time which is now pre-historic.

COMMENT:

This is perhaps entirely out of keeping with me in my present role, but I am not at all convinced that the universities are in that kind of happy position vis-a-vis the secondary and elementary schools. It seems to me that if you put emphasis on certification or emphasis on nonpermanent tenure, it seems to me that you are putting emphasis on the wrong end. What I would like to see is a lot more provision in school systems for continuous opportunity for teachers, at whatever level, to improve their qualifications. And it seems to me if this opportunity existed the legalistic technique of temporary certification or certification for five or ten years would not be the crutch that we may be now tempted to reach out for. I am convinced that the bulk of elementary school teachers would like to take six months off from their classroom every six or seven years to go back and learn what has happened in their field since they were certified, and if our systems were working in a way in which this opportunity was readily available to them, then we would not have to worry about certification.

MR. ROBB:

Well there are two or three things involved in the remarks of the last two or three speakers. I would tell Dr. Harris that in the organization I represent we have made steps at least toward doing the thing he talks about. Certification for secondary school teachers in this province is handled by the government, but our own professional organization issues its own type of certification, what we call a document of approval which is issued annually to each teacher, on the basis of demonstrated competence in the classroom. And those who fail to demonstrate competence in the classroom do not get this document from the organization. This does not mean that they are ineligible to teach because under the statues of the province if they hold governmental certification they still may be employed. But at least it givesthe employing agent some additional criteria on which he can assess the likelihood of competence from the person he is hiring. I would make a second observation. I think the day is coming when our permanent teaching certificates will be permanent for a definite period of time, perhaps five years. And at the end of this period in order to have the certificate renewed it will be necessary for the person to demonstrate that he has achieved at least a minimal standard of competence in the classroom, quite apart from academic achievement or certificates earned or things of this sort. The third observation I would make is in line with the last speaker. Our organization is very much interested in this process of continually up-dating the members of the profession. This is a difficult thing to do. We have made some steps towards its achievement, and I think eventually it will become standard practice that part of every teacher's working year will be a period of time devoted to refreshing himself in his own discipline, bringing himself up-to-date with new developments. And this will be part of the employment year.

DR. THOMAS:

I would like to add myself that it is interesting that there are two or three other professions undergoing exactly this kind of consideration at the moment. The problem was expressed I think most neatly by a French medical doctor who observed that, given the rate of research development in medicine and the rate of publishing which is astronomical, that every doctor was a little less competent in the morning than when he went to bed the night before. Veterinary medicine has in three states in the U.S.A. introduced a practice in which the certificate, the license, is renewable on a five year period and some indication of continuous self-refreshment has to be provided.

DR. NORMAN M. GOBLE, Canadian Teachers' Federation:

I do want to voice to the panel my dismay at a great deal that I have heard this morning and at the tone of much of the discussion this morning. Our educational systems are perhaps best described as an accumulation of haphazard modifications of an irrational tradition. It is much easier and much more comfortable to administer than to create. Therefore we impatiently tend to rush beyond the creative, theoretical stage and get into this comfortable role of administering. This has a number of effects, one of the effects is that the decisions that have shaped our educational patterns have generally been decisions of administrative convenience of a detailed nature which have added up eventually, of course, to quite fundamental and far-reaching changes of an educational nature, even with philosophical implications that were not foreseen or deliberately chosen in the first place. We cannot very long go on doing things in that kind of way. We start with detailed solutions before we look at the problem. We commit ourselves to procedures before we look at the demand, because we do not know quite what the demands or the needs are but, by golly, we know how to administer. This is a noble purpose, a noble aspiration this idea of community colleges. It is a proposal for a tremendous work of rescue, of social salvage, of ending the awful wastage of potential which we no longer continue to afford. Are we going to wreck it by going into it in our usual method of backward progression? The effects of this have been that we have equipped ourselves with educational institutions which generally started this way. You have defined an objective in terms of what you know can be administered and you create around that an institution in terms of how you know you can run an institution and then you take the youngsters and nail them by the thumbs to this framework. Our problem now is to deal with the vast majority whose thumbs tore off. And far too many of us are proposing to deal with this problem by building another similar framework and nailing them on by their toes this time.

Let's start at the other end. This was the whole idea wasn't it, to realize that you have human beings and each one of those human beings has some potential? And for heaven's sake let's start there. What is the potential in each of those human beings? What is the process that may develop that potential. What are the objectives that are appropriate to that potential? Derive the objectives from their potential. Devise the processes that can realize that potential towards the achievement of those objectives. And then you come to the learning situation that is appropriate to that potential and those objectives. And when you have discovered what kind of situation does what you want in that light, then ask the next question - what kind of teaching is it that creates this learning environment? And then go on and ask what kind of preparation will educate a person to produce that environment. Then ask the question - what kind of teachers have you ended up with. Let's not look at the kind of teachers we have now in our obsolete, outmoded, irrelevant institutions and then try to work backward.

If I could bring it round to a question to the panel, and I doubt whether I can now. I think it would probably go back to William Wordsworth and say "Whither is fled the visionary gleam?" Does the panel really think there is any hope for success in the community college venture, does the panel see any prospect of setting up the kind of studies and enquiries that would establish just what the functions of these things is supposed to be and of deriving the answers and solutions from those studies instead of doing it the wrong way round?

DR. THOMAS:

I think your question introduces a wrap-up response from the panel members if they want to respond.

DR. ROBB:

I do not think anyone would quarrel with Mr. Goble's philosophic position, but the fact still remains that we have these kids with us now and have to do something with them today. I am not sure that we can wait for the theorists to evolve all the answers to all these questions. I have no basic quarrel with his suggested approach to the problem, but I still maintain that this is not at variance with what the panel has really expressed. Perhaps we are starting at the wrong end and that we will get to the same place eventually. I would point out that despite all our theorizing in the final analysis we eventually evolve these institutions by a process of trial and error, and unless you try something you never make an error, and therefore you never move anywhere.

DR. GWILLIAM:

Perhaps again I sympathize with the speaker completely. The federal department with which I have been associated has been trying over the years to persuade educators to undertake research, and it is only in the last year or so that we have been relatively successful. Schedule 10 of the federal-provincial agreements is designed particularly to encourage people like yourselves to undertake such projects into the very problems that you raise. Ontario is engaged in several major projects which, whilst I am sure will not give answers to these problems next week, which is what some administrators want of course, perhaps will build into our systems a research capacity which we have never thought about until quite recently. It will be a long range pay-off, and I think that knowing full well the difficulties across the country of undertaking research in the educational manpower areas. I just say that there is not more than a handful of people who are capable or trained to do research at the moment. We have a major task of building up a large group of research workers who can undertake such tasks. I am sure the Canadian Teachers' Federation and other organizations are well aware of the difficulties of hiring people to do research projects of even the most elementary survey kind. Let me just finally say that the federal government has committed itself to spend about $200,000 already on major research projects in these areas, and I am hoping that more will be spent in the near future. But it does depend on the education officials themselves wishing to undertake some research activity. Generally speaking the attitude is that we will run around and look at what everybody else is doing, put it together, make it Ontario, Quebec, or whatever, and we go ahead and do the work.

DR. HARRIS:

I said in my initial remarks that I felt the community college was an entirely new area, separate from the university, separate from the elementary-secondary school, and I went on to say, or at least to imply, that in consequence the arrangement that applied in the training of university teachers and of elementary school teachers would not apply in this new area. I have interpreted what has gone on all morning as an attempt to say in a fumbling way what Dr. Goble has said so brilliantly. This has been the assumption the whole way through. O.K., we have got this new arrangement, what do we do? In the particular area of getting teachers, I am identified as a reactionary because I suggested that a B.A. or a first degree is appropriate to at least the core of personnel in the community colleges, the people who are really going to develop the program. This is simply my belief that the whole thing is extraordinarily important and the persons who are going to be in charge of this development must be people who are well trained and well educated, in the very broad sense, with an understanding of the very complex problem with which they have to deal.

MR. MONAHAM:

As a professor of philosophy I am very sensitive to the strictures that Dr. Goble made an impassioned plea for, that is the lack of concern with the abstract principles and the too great willingness to tinker with the administrative side of things before we figure out what we are trying to do with these new institutions. Apart from agreeing in general with what he said, I have no other comment to make save one and this may put me even further in the direction of the reactionaries than Robin Harris felt he had been put by insisting on a B.A. Conscious of the very immediate and pressing problem of providing for some educational experience and some useful training for the vast majority of our present population, who have not gone and who are not going to institutions of higher learning, I am and have been throughout the past couple of days rather uneasy about the assumption that only between 10% and 20% of our age group is capable of benefiting from a university education. I think, and this is admittedly an act of faith, but I think this is much too low. I am very critical of the kinds of programs that currently exist in many of our universities, but I think that there is some danger of developing non-university post-secondary types of education which might short-circuit the opportunities for some of our people to take university training. I would not want this danger to go without at least having a good mention.

DR. THOMAS:

Let me just say three things in summary and since each of you must make your own summary of this. It is quite clear that at this stage we are talking as much about ourselves and our own abilities at self-renewal and at seizing, planning and realizing a new idea, as we are talking about those other people who will take part in that idea. We are facing, I think, the awareness that the institutions and for many of us our very professions, which have come to the fore because of the presence of change in the society, are now affected directly because we have to face change as well. It is said that "he who rides the back of the tiger must fear to get off" and it seems to me that it is about at this stage that we consider teaching in relationship to administration and the kind of institution,that we are faced with the necessity of getting off the tiger. What is equally clear it seems to me is that the proper response to this challenge, the proper diverse evolution of this institution, is going to throw light on the entire educational process. It is going to act at its best, if you like, as a reform of all the other areas in which teaching and learning take place, because what we have been investigating this morning, far more than what kind of teaching we need for the community colleges, is what kind of teaching do we have now and how good is it and by what criteria is it judged? All the panelists and particularly Mr. Robb suggested that one of the great achievements, one of the great potentials of the community colleges may lie precisely in its need and ability to combine different styles of teaching, different educational expectations, different kinds of sensitivity, which up till now have tended to be in their own institutional settings and not in much contact with each other. And it may be out of the vitality of this confrontation which will be accompanied with irritation and with some hostilities and maybe some great learning as well, that it may be the vitality arising from this which will distinguish the contribution this institution can make. Let me thank the panelist and let me close with a comment from a most unexpected book, The Diary of Dag Hammarskjold. Hammarskjold to me was one of the great soldier scholars of the contemporary world, who combined the ability to reflect and think with a life of intense action and combined what have often been separated goals for education. And in one reflection he says - "To exist in the fleet joy of becoming, to be a channel for life as it flashes by in its gaiety and courage; cool water glittering in the sunlight in a world of sloth, anxiety and aggression; to exist for the future of others without being suffocated by their present."

THE FINANCING OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

IN CANADA

David A. A. Stager

Dean of Students

New College and Assistant Professor of Economics

University of Toronto

The Commission on the Financing of Higher Education in Canada pointed out in its Report that the problem confronting it was not just that of financing universities. "It has been clear from the start", the Commission noted, "that the problem was really one of financing post-secondary education in general." The Commissioners were quick to add, however, that the embryonic plans for junior colleges, regional colleges, community colleges, colleges of technology, and institutes created additional uncertainties in the projection of enrolments and of costs.

The Commission needed to produce a Report quickly and, more importantly, one which would receive widespread acceptance, especially by the provincial and federal governments. It could therefore not afford to make recommendations which would be based on the considerable speculation and highly debatable assumptions which characterize the non-university aspects of higher education at the present time.

At a conference such as this one, however, we not only can afford to be speculative and exploratory, we should be, if the appropriate issues are to be raised before fortuitous patterns become established. We have very few studies or reports in Canada to guide us on the special question of the financing of community colleges. The Bladen Report does deal with many of the general issues such as student aid and government control; and Mr. Maltby, at a similar conference last year, outlined the existing patterns of educational financing. There is, however, considerable experience with the financing of community colleges in the United States on which we can draw.

I propose to discuss, first of all, some of the economic aspects of education and to offer some rough estimates of the costs which can be expected, and finally, to venture some proposals for financing the new colleges in light of both Canadian and American experience.

Many of the recent studies in the economics of education have been concerned with questions of how much should be spent, by the private and public sectors, on education in general, and with whom should pay how much for education. What is essential now for rational planning in education is a method for studying the economic relationships of different types and levels of educational institutions and for comparing alternative proposed patterns of education.

The economic and financial problems of higher education are considerably complicated, however, by a lack of adequate systems of accounts, budgets, operating data and planning techniques in most universities and colleges. Most colleges have only the roughest notion of the actual cost of rendering separate educational and non-educational services and therefore do not really know the relationship between cost and price and returns. Furthermore, the problem of costing is not just one of accounts; there is also the problem of a rational distribution of costs between joint, or roughly complementary products. This makes it almost impossible for an economist to make useful recommendations on the allocation of funds among alternative educational programs. There is a strong need for better tools for fact finding, planning, operating analysis, and reporting so that college administrators will have a clearer frame of reference within which to make program decisions. Encouraging progress on this problem, however, has followed from the activities of the Bladen Commission. Professor Judy and Mr. Levine of the University of Toronto have developed a simulation model of the Toronto Arts and Science Faculty which will allow administrators to test a number of alternatives. Secondly, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada has announced recently that it plans to study the costs of university programs and activities in all faculties of the Canadian universities. These are the kinds of studies which will be necessary in the other types of post-secondary institutions.

The preceding remarks and studies have reference mainly to the internal efficiency of educational institutions and therefore to the total amount required for financing these institutions.

Other economic aspects of education have implications for the sharing of the cost of education. The economic returns to education have been studied from a number of approaches. These include 1) the contribution of education to economic growth; 2) the rate of return both to the individual and to society on investment in education; 3) education's contribution to manpower development.

The contribution of education to economic growth was a focal point of the Second Annual Review of the Economic Council of Canada. This report was based largely on a study of American economic growth by Denison. Denison's study used income differentials related to education levels and therefore did not take account of the indirect returns to education. In spite of this, Denison found that 23 percent, or nearly one-quarter , of the economic growth of the country, from 1929 to 1957, was attributable to the increased education of the labour force. President Kennedy, in his Message to Congress on Education in 1963, did take account of the indirect benefits such as the improvement of research and technology, when he stated that that education contributed some 40 percent of the nation's growth in productivity. The "contribution to growth" argument is probably the most effective one to use in a political appeal for more resources for education in general. It is not very useful, however, in the educational planning process.

The second approach, the private rates-of-return, relates the increase in expected lifetime income of the individual to his costs of increased education.

The social rate-of-return approach relates the increased incomes before taxes to the total costs of the increased education. For a number of reasons, the phrase "social rate-of-return" is a dangerous description of this rate but economists continue to use it for lack of a better term. Both of these approaches include in the costs the potential earnings which are foregone by the individual while he is at college. It is important that foregone earnings be considered, when policy decisions are made, for at least two reasons: 1) foregone earnings represent the largest component, in fact 60 per cent, of the total cost of higher education; 2) when we recognize that the student's time is not costless, the argument for efficiency in education is even stronger.

The rate-of-returns study which is of most immediate concern to us is one by Hansen in which he found that, after the completion of one year of college, the average rate of return on three more years is less for the individual than for society. This suggests, according to Hansen "that the student pays more than his own way in securing schooling at the college level. This might indicate the need for a re-study of the assessment of the costs of college against the individual, unless the possible under-investment in college training that would be produced is regarded as acceptable in some broader sense." I shall return to the rate-of-returns approach and its implication for financing policy in a later section of this paper.

Reference to manpower development is made frequently in discussions of educational planning and financing, because manpower considerations raise more sharply the question of the priorities that are to be assigned to the various levels and types of educational programs. One obvious difficulty in using this approach is that there is only a very general relationship between an occupation and the educational level required for that occupation. Furthermore, the increasing mobility among occupations makes it even more difficult to base educational plans on forecasts of manpower "needs". The objection to this approach which is more germane to a financing discussion, however, is made by Professor Bowen of Princeton:

> "The point is", he argues, "that estimates of the future needs of people with a given kind of training who are 'needed' or 'wanted' are rather devoid of meaning unless one also has a good idea of the relation between the benefits to be obtained by having this number of trained persons and the costs involved in having them."

This argument implies the social rate-of-return approach which was just discussed.

We shall see later that these economic aspects of education are quite relevant to decisions on sharing the costs of education. At this point, however, I would like to speculate on what the costs will be for community colleges.

I shall deal only with the Ontario situation, and I hasten to apologize to delegates from the other provinces for this. I expect, though, that some general aspects of the exercise will be useful to you.

Premier Robarts expressed a fundamental government policy when he stated that

> "It is the task and purpose of this government to provide whatever opportunities are necessary to enable each inidivdual through education, to develop his potentialities to the fullest degree and to employ his talents to the greatest advantage..."

I am assuming, in the enrolment estimates that follow, that the Ontario Government gives some meaning to its stated policy by making provision by 1976 for every high school graduate who wishes to continue to post-secondary education. The specific, major assumptions, which you may wish to challenge, and I hope you do, are as follow:

1) Community colleges will be established in every urban area with a population of at least 20,000 and a surrounding regional population of 80,000 to 100,000. This would entail about 40 colleges. It would put 95 percent of Ontario's high school graduates within 30 miles of a college and about 75 percent within 10 miles.

2) The community colleges would offer two-year programs and, whereever potential enrolments made it feasible, encompass the programs now offered in the institutes of technology, the teachers colleges, nursing schools and some of the private business and trade schools. When these estimates were being made, the Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers had not reported. Their recommendation that elementary school teachers will eventually have to hold a university degree is commendable. It means though that the estimates presented here must be reduced by the projections for enrollees in the universities' teacher training programs. On the other hand I understand that there is considerable support for including nursing training in the new colleges.

3) The colleges would admit any high school graduate. I have not included an estimate of the number of persons who would enrol under the Ontario provision that anyone over 18 is eligible for admission to these colleges. There is not previous evidence which would enable us to make reliable estimates in this case. Nor have I included an estimate of the part-time enrolments.

4) The proportion of high school graduates going to university would be unchanged. If the university enrolments are as predicted by Dr. Sheffield in the Bladen Report , then the community colleges enrolment estimates should be reduced by 10 percent, since the Bladen Commission assumed that the development of community colleges would have a negligible effect on university enrolments.

5) By 1976, 10 percent of the high school graduates would not continue to full-time post-secondary education of some kind, due to marriage , necessity to employment, or for other reasons. (In 1961 about 45 percent of the high school graduates did not continue to post-secondary education.)

6) Grade 13 would be "phased out" or "telescoped in", before 1976 and university preparatory courses would be taught in Grade 12. Few, if any, students would take this preparatory work in two years.

On the basis of these assumptions we could expect 83,000 students, in 1976, to enrol in the First Year of the community colleges and 67,000 in the Second Year. The Second Year estimate is 20 percent less than for the First Year to allow for the failure rate and the slightly lower entering class in the previous year. Thus, we could expect a total enrolment of 150,000.

Although this total figure may be difficult to accept on first glance, it does not seem unreasonable, if appropriate facilities can be provided, to expect a four to five-fold increase in all other forms of post secondary education when the Bladen Commission predicted a three-fold increase in the enrolment of the well-established university system.

Furthermore, if the community college estimates are reduced by 10 percent, to 135,000, and are added to the Bladen projection of 155,000 the participation rate for all post-secondary education can be obtained. According to these calculations, nearly 50 percent of the 18 to 21 year old age group would be enrolled in post-secondary institutions in 1976. The comparable figure for the United States in 1963 was 40 percent; it is expected to be about 60 percent in 1976.

What are the costs entailed in these estimates? Again, we must make some quite strong assumptions and draw heavily on the data for similar institutions such as teachers colleges, nursing schools, and institutes of technology. The cost per student in each of these institutions are surprisingly alike. In 1963-4, the operating costs per full-time student in the institutes of technology ranged from $600 to $800; for teachers colleges the average was $700; the average for hospital nursing schools was $750 (excluding training assistance and perquisites.) When part-time students are included in the calculation for the institutes of technology, by giving them a weight of one quarter, the range for the institutes is $500 to $600. On the basis of the present composition of enrolment in non-university post-secondary education, these costs average $700. This is exactly one third the operating cost (including assisted research) per full-time student in Ontario universities in 1963-4.

I am inclined to believe that $700 per full-time student is a rather low figure on which to base an estimate for 1976, especially because this was the average cost in California's junior colleges in 1957-8 and because Macdonald in his Report for British Columbia put the cost at $900 for 1965. There is no apparent rationalization, however, for a higher cost estimate.

If we use the $700 estimate (in 1963-4 prices) and if community college operating costs grow at the rate predicted for universities by the Bladen Commission, then the operating cost per full-time student in community colleges in 1976 will be $1400.

The operating costs for the estimated 150,000 students would be 210 million dollars.

Capital cost estimates have been omitted from this paper both because they are more closely related to the "program mix" of the new colleges and because such estimates would require even more speculative assumptions about the size and number of colleges to be constructed each year over the next decade. If you were to suggest, however, that the capital costs over the next 10 years would total about 400 million dollars in today's prices, you probably would be fairly close. A few remarks on the methods of physical plant financing are included in the following section.

The many proposals in answer to the question "who should pay for higher education?" are considered concisely in the Bladen Report. We can therefore skip quickly over the general issues and draw the special implications for community colleges. First of all, what is the typical pattern for the financial support of public community colleges in the United States? Could this pattern be adopted, or adapted, for Canada? I refer especially to those states with the greatest number of two-year colleges: California, Texas, Florida, Mississippi, New York, Illinois and Michigan. In California and Mississippi, four-fifths of the operating revenue comes from local sources, one-fifth from the state, no tuition fee is charged; in Texas, New York and Michigan, the state, the locality and the student each contribute one-third of revenue; in Florida, the state pays two-thirds of the cost with the local government and the student bearing the remainder almost equally; in Illinois, the student pays one-tenth of the cost while the state and local government divide equally on the balance.

A brief review of these and other States reveals little similarity in the patterns of support. Two generalizations, though, do emerge: firstly the principle of sharing costs is widely accepted. Usually the students, the district, and the State each contribute an appreciable but varying amount; secondly, an increasingly prevalent pattern is that in which the student, the locality, and the State each contribute an equal share of the cost.

Consider the student first. Should he be expected to contribute and, if so, how much? This is not a question, in the first instance, of whether governments should support education by direct grants or indirectly through the students; it is a question of whether the student should contribute from his own, or family, resources.

The argument that the state should now provide fourteen(or more) years of "free" education because it previously provided elementary and secondary education can be dismissed readily. Education can never be "free" until compensation is made for the earnings foregone. At the post-secondary level these are significant. Foregone earnings at the elementary and secondary level, because of the child employment laws, are negligible except in the final year or two. Elementary and secondary education has been provided at no cost to the student because, as early as the 1640's the New England colonies realized that decisions regarding children's education should not be left to parents.

This decision was followed, albeit somewhat later, by government financial support. Until such time as the state may increase the legal school-leaving age to eighteen, there is little reason to expect full financial support from the state.

Tuition fees should be charged at the post-secondary level not because this additional source partly offsets a fear of government control, nor because there is something morally good about doing so, nor because fees are essential to meet the shortfall in government support, but because education confers significant direct benefits on the students themselves (ranging from potentially higher lifetime earnings and more attractive jobs to the immediate pleasures of "college days" and increased long term ability to enjoy leisure time). On the other hand, post-secondary education generates what the economist calls "external economies" or "social benefits". In the case of community colleges, one of major "external economies" will be the increased flexibility of the labour force and a more satisfactory labour market resulting from improved guidance and placement services. I cannot argue for full-cost pricing of education, as some economists have done, because the total amount of education demanded would fall short of the optimal level to the extent that social returns exceed private returns.Further study is urgently needed in this area to determine the size of subsidies required, in the form of reduced fees , for the most socially desirable programs. Incidentally, fees should not be different for residents and for non-residents. If the non-resident remains, the province benefits by his increased education; if he leaves, the province has contributed to national understanding and unity.

If students are to pay tuition fees, what of the "equal opportunity" or "universal accessibility" arguments? Should the student receive bursaries or take out a loan? For the reasons cited previously, that education confers direct benefits on the individual, the student should finance his education by loans. It should be added parenthetically that scholarships should continue to be given in recognition of academic merit.

These are the long-term arguments. The short-term view, especially in the case of the new colleges, leads to quite different conclusions. What the Robbins Committee said of higher education in general in Great Britain is especially true for a new type of educational institution which will enrol students who , *on the average* , come from lower income families and whose parents had no post-secondary education.

The Robbins *Report* stated:

> "On balance we do not recommend immediate recourse to a system of financing students by loans. At a time when many parents are only just beginning to acquire the habit of contemplating higher education for such of their children, especially girls, as are capable of benefiting by it, we think it probable that it would have undesirable disincentive effects. But if, as time goes on, the habit is more firmly established, the arguments of justice in distribution and of advantage in increasing individual responsibility may come to weigh more heavily and lead to some experiment in this direction." (p.212) (That is, in the direction of loans.)

Bursaries should be used only to offset any disincentive effect that fees might have. Continuing studies will be necessary to determine when, to what extent and in what form loans may be introduced. This should imply, by the way, that quite different student aid schemes are necessary for the new community colleges than has been announced by the Department of University Affairs for Ontario's universities.

The disincentive effects of tuition fees are probably less for persons who are enrolled on a part-time basis since they have been working and are therefore more aware of the tangible benefits of additional education.There should be a lesser, if any, need to offer bursary aid to them. Nor is there any "social justice" argument for charging them a different fee, proportionately, than is paid by full-time students.

To overcome the "disincentive problem" as quickly as possible, and as an integral feature of any financing schemes, the results of rate of return and other studies should be made available in simple form to high school students, their guidance teachers and parents. "Selling" more education to students may be necessary for some time. Most surveys indicate, for example, that it is to obtain a better job and increased earnings that students continue their education. This,one would expect, would be even truer of students in two-year colleges than in universities. It is to be hoped, however, that an appreciation of the non-economic benefits of education will come later.

An estimate of the amounts to come from the student and from public sources based on social and private rates of return unfortunately must await further study in this area. Meanwhile, rough justice can be done by reference to the distribution of costs in the universities. In 1963-64, university tuition fees represented 28 percent of the operating income (excluding assisted research). On the assumption that the social returns exceed private returns, per student, to a greater extent for universities than for community colleges, a tuition fee of one-third the operating costs seems appropriate for the community colleges. Two-thirds of the operating costs must come from public sources.

In most discussions on the establishing of community colleges, it is argued that enthusiastic local support is essential to the success of a college. Local support is then usually translated as local financing. Municipalities, however, should be exempted from major financial contributions, to the community colleges. Local businesses should be encouraged, though, to contribute to special project funds. Many smaller corporations and individuals may choose to contribute to a local college whereas they would not be especially interested in a more remote university.

The reasons for omitting municipalities from the financial sources are probably well-known and need only brief mention. The municipalities depend on real estate tax and their assessment values vary widely. In a short study I did earlier, I found that at a one-half-mill rate only three out of 37 communities could raise $200 per student whereas at even a two-mill rate 25 percent of the communities could not raise this amount. Furthermore, the communities requiring the highest rates to support their colleges would probably benefit the least since many of their graduates would seek employment in the larger centres. As we saw earlier, most of the American community colleges do receive substantial financial assistance from the locality. This, however, is a holdover from the past when the population was less mobile and it was the community which benefited most by the local college. Some of the States, Massachusetts especially, are now taking over the municipalities' financial responsibilities.

This leaves the provincial and federal governments as the main sources of funds. The appropriate shares for the federal and provincial governments is a pragmatic question concerning the tax-sharing agreements rather than a constitutional question. On the basis of the present agreements, an equal sharing of the balance of the operating costs seems appropriate. This means that one-third of the total cost would be borne by the student, one-third by the province and one-third by the federal government.

In the case of the federal government, this is simply asking for a broader interpretation of the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. To provide assistance under the Act, for example, for the training of medical technologists but not for nurses seems inconsistent. Furthermore, to describe electronics, but not English, as a vocational course, is to take a narrow and short-sighted view of the skills required by graduates of these colleges. Although this Act was a major contribution to the development of post-secondary education, it will bias future patterns of education in an undesirable way unless the terms of the Act are amended significantly when it is revised in 1967. Dr. Andrew Stewart points out in his recent Report the dangers of restrictive grants. He said

> "The grant structure seems to have had some effect on the relative emphasis on the different functions performed by the college."

and

> "... it appears that the formulae for support of the junior colleges have contributed to the pre-occupation of the college with university education and to the failure to undertake other programs, including extension programs."

Dr. Stewart's concern was with academic rather than technical programs but the basic problem is the same in both cases.

There is nothing wrong of course with using differential grants to provide for special needs. Too often though the governments may not be aware of the undesirable effects the grants will have, and worse, they may not be clear on what the efffects should be.

When we come to the provincial governments there is only one major point that needs to be made. The Bladen Commission recommended the use of a financial formula for the allocation of funds among universities. The need for such a formula will be even greater in the case of community colleges. A financing formula would be based on the relative costs of different programs in the colleges and would assign funds according to the number of students in each program. All of the major States have resorted to such formulas both to reduce the time required to review the budget proposals and to maintain some fiscal autonomy for the individual colleges. The use of formula financing could be coupled with a five-year grant plan such as is used in the United Kingdom. Some of the objections to long-term grants are that prices may increase in unexpected ways and unforeseen needs arise. These problems would be offset, however, by reference to the annual cost studies which are necessary in developing the finance formula.

The financing of capital costs has purposefully been left until the end. There are only two remarks to be made here. The case could be argued effectively, I believe, for partly financing the capital costs of the new colleges from a federal Capital Grant Fund such as the Bladen Report recommends for universities. The provincial share would probably be raised through loans, but I agree with the Robbins Committee that "the question whether (loan finance) would be a desirable complication in the general planning of public investment is highly technical and we prefer to leave it for more expert discussion." (p.210)

The many questions concerned with the financing of community colleges obviously have no simple answers. Community colleges, however, are such an important innovation in Canadian education that their financing deserves, even demands, the issues be opened to widespread, informed discussions. In Morley's biography of Benjamin Disraeli, the author points out that "People do not attend public meetings to be taught, but to be excited, flattered and pleased." There has not been much flattery in what I have said; you may not always have been pleased, but if you have been excited to a discussion of these important questions, then we will have accomplished much.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR ARISING FROM GROUP DISCUSSION

WILLIAM PIERCE, Frontier College:

I think Prof. Stager knows from remarks I made behind his back that I was going to disagree with him somewhere. I would like to step out of my role at Frontier College if I may because I do not think we are directly concerned, but as anybody can tell from my tartan I do come from the Province of New Brunswick where the average income is about $2,000. I am very happy to see that in the Minister's speech he referred to the tuition fee in the new Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology as going to be normal. I can realize that from an economist's point of view probably your statements are quite correct, but I suggest that, if not in a wealthy province like Ontario and I doubt if the northern part is, at least in the less wealthy provinces asking the student to pay as much as a third of the tuition costs is much too much and maybe you already agree with that. I would hope that some of the moral issues of social justice will enter into the decisions on tuition fees besides that of the economic one.

DEAN STAGER:

It is more by way of comment than by answer, I did point out it was the economist's point of view, but I would like to have your return comments. If you were to have a tuition fee in the community colleges of say zero instead of $300 this might be about 10% of the total costs if we include foregone earnings. Now I ask two questions; is 10% that important when a person is making his educational decision, and secondly is it possible that he completely ignores his foregone earnings? If tuition fees are as important as you say they are, it suggests to me that he completely ignores, shall we say, $5,000 for round figures that he could be earning per year.

WILLIAM PIERCE:

Well I think from an economist's point of view it is a very good argument to say that a student who is going to earn more money as a result of his education should contribute towards his education. Maybe we could hear Mr. Earle from Newfoundland say something about that. However, I think that when you take the condition of a student graduating from high school, where he has no money and may have to go to a strange town, although a community college may help, where he has to pay room and board, buy very expensive text books, and support himself in other ways over and above the cost of tuition, that even if you are saying from an economist's point of view that he should pay for his education at that moment he does not have the cash to pay for it. Now the thousand dollar federal student loan has gone a little way towards helping in this situation, but I found that that is merely a drop in the bucket as far as students' expenses are concerned these days. And so although you may be right from an academic and economist's point of view, when you consider the position of the individual student, at least to the east of Ontario, and I think in the North of Ontario also, and from what I have seen of the northern parts of the provinces to the west, that your argument is not valid.

DEAN STAGER:

Well I think you are arguing exactly the same point I am. What we need is a well-developed loan scheme and particularly if the community college is to be the adult training education centre that we have suggested over the last two days it certainly must be. A man who has a family to support and probably a home to continue certainly needs a very sophisticated loan scheme at his disposal. What I am arguing essentially is that a bursary scheme should be very short-term one that when we do set up bursaries we recognize them as a short-term, stop-gap measure and that we be concerned with developing the most sophisticated and the far ranging loan scheme which will be necessary ten years from now.

WILLIAM PIERCE:

I would like to see an increase in the availability and size of loans available, but I would also argue that the student going on for say five or six years of post-secondary education is going to get himself in pretty fantastic debts in terms of what he can earn immediately after he graduates and therefore I would make a plea also, for the students who need it, for a large bursary program as well as a loan program.

DEAN STAGER:

And this is where the social worker, or the sociologist comes into the picture, tells us what sort of outstanding credit persons at this age should be carrying and this is what I was suggesting that many persons concerned with education should be stating their position on these many questions.

Comment:

I have applied for money. I have no assurance that I am going to get any. I am going to have to borrow money in September to complete my education. The hardship not only of having to borrow money, but of having to give up a kind of life, a standard of living that people perhaps of my age have worked hard for leaves me a bit uneasy when people say "everybody can get an education, it is there, all you have to do is to look for it." It comes down to the basic fact of dollars and cents. You mentioned earlier that "education will never be free" and perhaps this is the way it should be. But I feel some indication certainly should be given to people that are looking for more education as to whether or not they are going to be able to do it from a financial point of view.

DEAN STAGER:

I think there are only two answers to your comments and the first one is that we do need a much better loan scheme than we have. This is what I was suggesting. Your problems about not knowing whether you would be able to get a loan and when, are certainly problems of administration and, I think, broader ones of concept. I think loans should be available to any student who is registered in any legitimate educational program. And an investment in education is one of the safest ones that can be made. Secondly I am not sure that there should be the great burden attached to educational loans that there seems to be. After all the increase in debt carried by our population is considerable, it is increasing annually, and I think that there needs to be a change in attitude. This is why I was using words like habit. We need to view taking loans for education in a much different way than we have in the past.

DR. ALAN THOMAS:

I thought that the data that you did use was admirable. But you had to dismiss areas in which you simply had no data to work on and this was in terms of age populations outside of the conventional school group, different kinds of students. Now it strikes me that the concept towards which we have been struggling in the last two days is a concept which suggests that precisely the areas you had to dismiss in fact become the pre-occupation of the community college. I wonder if you would take an educated guess at this stage because while it seems to me the formulation of data is excellent, it is the use of it that worries me in terms of projecting the cost of the community college. Would you even guess on the degree to which data regarding the unconventional student, both in terms of the kinds of studies, the kind of relationship he has with the institution, and also the kind of age he is, will alter the situation? Is that data likely to completely alter the kind of data you have, and if it is, can you guess in which direction it might alter it, so that one can make some guesses about financial plans that will allow for the surprises that the encouragement of the unconventional student may provide in terms of financial projections?

DR. STAGER:

As Alan pointed out I had limited data and the statement I wanted to make was that this would be the cost at a minimum , that government and persons concerned must realize that in 1976 we must be prepared to spend $210 million per year for the operating costs of these institutions. Now there may be a danger of course, in making a statement like this . The governments may accept it as the maximum. But if we are thinking of the adult student, about double the number I suggested would seem reasonable, in terms of full-time equivalents about 300,000 students. And I think that the effect of the part-time and the mature student coming back to the community college would only enhance the enrollment of those who are going from full-time secondary to full-time tertiary.

DR. ALAN THOMAS:

Onetrailer question. Your projections are based on a cost per student. Is there any basis for us deciding whether or not some kinds of part-time and older students may in fact cost more than the student on whom you are making your estimation? And this is also a necessary part of our approaching this issue on a sensible basis.

DR. STAGER:

Or it may cost less. I think a mature student might make efficient use of the resources.

DR. NORMAN GOBLE:

I know that economists must work in economics, and cannot make any comment on the propriety of reaching certain decisions. There is an increasing volume of evidence across the country that suggests that generally speaking, and subject to many exceptions, the population of our universities tends to consist of young people who got there because their families were in an economic situation rather better than the average, and therefore that direct assistance to university students tends to confirm, make permanent and even make hereditary the condition of privilege. If you take money away from the general population and give it to them you are taking from the "have-nots" and giving to the "haves". This is one of the reasons why when university is mentioned as a possible analogy to the community college I shudder. Let us stay away from that comparison. The community colleges are going to be an attempt to remedy a serious social and educational state of injustice in our society. Is there any hope that in connection with financing them there will be devised some principles of the financing of elementary, pre-elementary and secondary education that will be an new an approach to the problem of economic injustice in our society as the community colleges are new in their approach to the problem of educational inequality?

DR. STAGER:

I would agree completely if not emphasize the remarks you have made that the community college certainly is being established to overcome many of the social inadequacies or injustices. The bursary schemes which will be essential, and on a much larger scale than we have known in the past, must be seen as short-term schemes and when the community colleges are well established, when and if the habit of post secondary education is well established, only at that time do we switch to a loan scheme. But I am concerned that if we get into a bursary scheme the reasons for introducing it will have been forgotten. So many institutions, so many arrangements we have made continue and the reasons for introducing them are forgotten and take on new meanings. Even in the long run, apart from the economic return to the individual, one reason I am concerned about using a loan scheme is that I am afraid if we don't the government funds (federal and provincial) which would be available for capital financing will be diverted to bursaries. You may be more familiar with the situation in England than I am. Certainly only the upper classes and upper middle classes were entering the universities. The Robbin's committee not only for economic reasons but for other social justice reasons emphasized the need for loans, so that the somewhat fixed bundle of government funds available for education would be used for capital financing. Once you make the places available, somehow or other those students who want to get there will go on to post-secondary education. If you make one hundred places available, one hundred places will be filled. If on the other hand you use the money to provide fifty places and then give bursaries to those fifty people, you have ignored the other fifty who I submit will come from the more disadvantaged families than the first fifty. This is second reason I argue for a loan scheme and for some contribution from the students, so the federal and provincial money will be available for capital financing. In your second question you were asking about the elementary and secondary school financing. I think you may have reference to the need for special classes for disadvantaged students, for specially privileged students, whatever the case may be. I think if we do accept the government policy, the social policy that we must provide the best opportunity for everyone to make full use of his intellectual and other resources that this implies that we have the arrangements available, financing arrangements available for all of these students. If government makes the decision that everyone will be in school until aged 16 or 18, then I think it is essential that government provide those opportunities for the different types of students.

MR. EARLE:

The Hon. H.R.V.Earle, Minister of Education, Newfoundland:

We feel that in doing what we are for our university students, and I hope that if we get in the community college area we will be able to do as well if not better, through completely free tuition and added to that what may be a real shock to you the addition of salaries and allowances to students. We are reacting in a way which is rather the adverse to what the Dean said. We feel that we are not only helping the student but we are helping the economy and I would like to finish by asking a question. If he does not feel that in prodding the people into the field of education where it is most needed we are not at the same time prodding the economy of the future of our province and we think, we are quite convinced actually, that this move of ours is an extremely wise investment in the future.

DR. STAGER:

I can only say, sir, that I completely agree with you. I hope your scheme is only a short-term one until Newfoundland too has a very strong habit of post-secondary and that the funds you have made available for the payment of fees will become available to provide more places and better facilities.

SUMMARY: Garnet Page, Conference Chairman.

We commenced our discussions by an examination of the need for and the role of the Community College in our society. Caught up in an ever-increasing rate of technological change, we are discovering that our educational methods and structures are not doing the whole job, and that our traditional concepts of work and employment are becoming obsolete.

We found that education faces a double challenge, that of bringing its structure and method of operation up-to-date and casting off the shackles of traditional, restrictive conservatism. It must be capable of adjusting to future demands, and of fulfilling new, different and pressing social needs.

Early in the seminar we noted a tendency to equate the junior college, designed to provide university transfer credits, with the Community College, and the concensus appeared to be that this was indeed undesirable and quite foreign to the primary purpose of the Community College.

It was recognized that, if the universities so desire, they may and probably should allow certain appropiate credits for achievement at Community Colleges, but that the pattern of education at the Community College should be not structured with this as the guiding and predominant principle. It was considered that the true Community College should be located in a physical establishment, with curricula designed to meet the needs of its own locality and of its own students, and that, while recognizing the economy's growing demand for new, different and generally higher skills in "mixes" which change through time and geography, the Community College must satisfy an equally important need for a programme of flexible, continuing, "popular" education in the broadest sense.

The exchange of information about the different approaches to the Community College concept in the various parts of Canada was most rewarding It was interesting to learn of the broadening scope of the Community Colleges in Ontario, and of that province's plans to decentralize the responsibility for the "management" of these institutions, while still maintaining an essential and sensible measure of control of the minimum criteria and standards by the Department of Education.

Equally intriguing was the discussion of the method and degree of involvement of the various segments of other social institutions in the planning, administration and curriculum development of the Community College, and in the articulation of its programme with the traditional patterns of formal education.

There may have been some over-emphasis on these matters, with a resulting lack of stress on the fundamental concept and social role of the Community College. We heard of several methods of involvement - or lack of involvement - of boards, advisory committees, the community, faculty, business and industry and of students in these important matters and again there seemed to be too great a preoccupation with the transfer credit question, as opposed to attending to the major tasks of the Community College.

We were also warned against too great a liasion with and inflmence by the business and industrial community in an effort to make every single thing done at a Community College capable of direct and immediate application to the world of work.

In passing, I was impressed by the lack of recognition of the great supportive contribution which can and must be made by the professional community as such. I was also impressed by a sort of understatement of the availability of the advantages of the Community College to the entire population, to the "respectability" of this avenue of education, and to the general absence of built-in social barriers to participation in adult education at the Community College.

However, I detected a tendency to play down or by-pass the requirements for a guidance and counselling service, and when it was mentioned, to assign to it a role which can work great harm on the concept and acceptability of the Community College. Is it now true that when we say " do a good job at the Community College and perhaps you may then be acceptable for a higher level of education" - does this not create a definitely negative impression? Should we not say "do a good job here and you will be better at what you do and how you live" - in a positive way.

Some of the new approaches to the architectural design and layout of universities were explored, since they may apply equally to Community Colleges. The most significant approaches seemed to be an improved provision for easy expansion of departments by relatively small increments, and improved and increased arrangements for the formal and informal, planned and unplanned, contact between the faculties and students of all departments.

The training,selection and organization of the teaching staffs of Community Colleges provided a basis for some interesting speculation about the various teaching staff models which might serve as a sort of guide to the structuring of the teaching staffs of Community Colleges, if indeed it would be wise to follow any existing model or models.

The consensus appeared to be that the broad role of the Community College demands a wide variety of teaching staff, with an accompanying wide variety of special skills and aptitudes, quite different from the "sameness" which one observes in some parts of the existing educational structure. There is a strong suggestion of a needed basic qualification of some sort, and there is general agreement on the essential requirement that teachers possess a demonstrated ability to function as a teacher.

Such a varied assortment of people, all teachers at a Community College, make it essential that careful administration must be brought to bear in selecting the teachers and in welding the group together, developing a true esprit-de-corps, and in handling wisely the serious problems of title, salary, work-load, etc. Such a faculty, all imbued with a team spirit and a sense of real participation in a body of responsible people, and with a desire to advance its own professional development on a continuing basis seems to be the desired one.

There seemed to be no active and positive general agreement on a form of organization or a type of organizational affiliation of teachers at Community Colleges, although a number of personal opinions were put forward. In discussion of the financial patterns and problems related to Community Colleges, it became obvious that the economist has a most important role to play in identifying the several economic issues which confront us. These issues may be different from those arising from political and social considerations, and often widely at variance with those of the educator ; and they must be clearly identified and separated and must be recognized and considered as such, and not allowed to muddy further the thinking about overall problems. Otherwise we may well fall further into the trap of planning our Community Colleges to fall into the various categories of education and training most likely to receive maximum financial support from traditional sources, to the detriment of what otherwise might be a far more useful overall programme.

It is only natural that a good many of the points raised at the 1965 conference on Adult Education in Community Colleges were brought forward again. Rather than recite these, I refer you to Dr. Alan Thomas' excellent recapitulation which appears in the proceedings of that meeting and to my own brief introductory remarks at our opening session on Monday.

To me, the most significant aspect of this three-day national seminar is that we have been able to determine and discuss some of the problem areas, even though experience has not yet suggested their solution, whereas only a few years ago it would have been impossible even to assemble a group of 150 from all parts of Canada to discuss this matter, let alone to identify some of the more important problem areas. Even so, I note with some regret the lack of what might be considered a full representation of the majority of the organizations which cooperated in the sponsorship of the seminar.

It appears to be obvious that we have, in the Community College, an opportunity to do something new and exciting in Canadian education in filling the broad and basic needs of the community. I trust that we will be able to develop new and different philosophies and techniques to meet the challenge of this opportunity, rather than imitate, adapt and otherwise deform the methods of our traditional educational patterns in an attempt to make them fit the different shapes and sizes of this new educational service. We must not become preoccupied with detailed procedures before examining the whole problem.

For the first time in our history, the latent human potential for intellectual, cultural, esthetic and even physical growth - which so far has been suppressed for many the essential pressures of the world of work - may be released and nurtured, to create a social fabric of greater brightness and richness than we have ever known.

We must not become so preoccupied with the ease of administration rather than the problems of creation and with an economic and mechanistic approach to the philosophy of the Community College, or so engrossed with demanding a materialistic, transfer credit, and even a "cold cash" return from the programme that we lose sight of the fact that education must provide an answer to the two major challenges which are put squarely before us by the increasing rate of application of technology to the economy.

Certainly, we must educate people to ensure an adequately trained manpower to operate the economy, and to keep this manpower properly and continuously retrained or upgraded. But also, and I deem this to be equally important to Canada, I suggest that education, particularly in the Community College, must be an end in itself and a contribution to how we live as civilized human beings.

We must provide an environment in which the ordinary citizen, many of whom may have had little formal education, may discover and develop himself, learning of his strengths and weaknesses, his potentials for growth and, above all, the cultivation of the interests which constitute a true expression of each individual's human identity. After all, human beings can only perform with excellence in those areas in which they are interested, and only such performance can bring them real satisfaction and meaning, thus enabling them to make their maximum contribution to society.

Determining, and working toward the actual achievement of the role of the Community College, is the most important and exciting next step in Canadian education. This conference has helped us all forward in this task, and I express our collective appreciation to the Canadian Association for Adult Education and to the six cooperating bodies, to our speakers and panel members, and to Dr. Thomas and his staff, for providing us with this opportunity.

Finally, it has been a great pleasure to serve you as your general chairman. I have found it a rewarding personal experience, and I sincerely appreciate each and every delegate's obvious interest and enthusiasm. May I wish you the best of good luck and success in your important work.

RE..... COMMUNITY COLLEGES .....

A comprehensive bibliography is available from the CAAE Library and Information Service.

- COMMUNITY COLLEGES: selected publications from education libraries in Toronto. Compiled by, L. M. Bratty. 14 p.

PARTICIPANTS

National Seminar on the Community College in Canada,
May 30, 31 and June 1, 1966

TORONTO

Mr. P. F. Burgen,
Superintendent of Schools,
Edmonton Public School Board,
10733 - 101 Street,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dr. H. O. Barrett,
90 Berkinshaw Crescent,
Don Mills, Ontario.

Mr. Jean-Marie Beauchemin,
Secretaire general,
Federation des Colleges,
1940 est, boul. Henri-Bourassa,
Montreal 12e, P.Q.

Mr. Claude Beauregard,
1940 Henri-Bourassa East,
Montreal 12, P.Q.

Mr. A. A. Beveridge,
Director of University Extension,
University of Waterloo,
Waterloo, Ontario.

Mr. Jack P. Blaney,
Department of Extension,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, B.C.

Mr. Irving D. Boigon,
61 Curlew Drive,
Don Mills, Ontario.

Prof. Marianne Bossen,
Assistant Professor of Economics,
Lakehead University,
Port Arthur, Ontario.

Dr. Harold S. Braun,
Director of University Schools,
Lakehead University,
Port Arthur, Ontario.

Mr. Duncan Campbell,
Director, Department of Extension,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. Gordon Campbell, Principal,
Selkirk College,
Castlegar, B.C.

Mr. A. L. Cartier,
Community Programmes Branch,
Department of Education,
Victoria, B.C.

Mr. J.V. Chapman,
Vice President,
U.P.A.C.E. Limited,
Suite 400, 123 Eglinton Avenue East,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Harry B. Costello,
Executive Assistant,
Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation,
Box 1108,
Saskatoon, Sask.

Mr. W. J. Cousins, Dean,
Lethbridge Junior College,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Mr. D. H. Craighead,
Technological & Trades Training Branch,
Ontario Department of Education,
55 Eglinton Avenue East,
Toronto 12, Ontario.

Mr. B. E. Curtis, Director,
Adult Education,
Collegiate Institute Board of Ottawa,
662 Lyon Street,
Ottawa 1, Ontario.

Mr. R. W. Dalton,
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Department of Education,
Legislative Building,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. S. Davidovich, Director,
Training & Development Services,
Ontario Department of Civil Service,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. J. A. G. Davidson,
Robert Simpson Company,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. C. E. Dooley,
Trustee,
Regina Board of Education,
Regina, Sask.

Mr. Howard Day,
Vancouver City College,
King Edward Centre,
Vancouver 9, B.C.

Mr. Tom Dennett,
Faculty Association,
Vancouver City College,
King Edward Centre,
Vancouver 9, B.C.

Mr. H. E. Dinsdale,
4260 Hampton Avenue,
Montreal 28, P.Q.

Mr. Malcolm Fisher,
Student,
Vancouver City College,
Vancouver, B.C.

Dr. Ross Ford, Director,
Training Branch,
Dept. Citizenship &
Immigration, Ottawa, Ont.

Mr. John H. Fox,
Vice President, Commercial
Division,
Honeywell Controls Limited,
109 Vanderhoof Avenue,
Toronto 17, Ont.

Miss Kathleen Francoeur,
Department of Education,
Quebec, P.Q.

Miss Gertrude M. Fatt,
Toronto Board of Education,
155 College Street,
Toronto 2B, Ontario.

Mr. N. J. Gamble,
Mount Royal Junior College,
Calgary, Alberta.

Mr. Don Garvie,
Ontario Crafts Foundation,
113 St. George Street,
Toronto 5, Ontario.

Miss Margaret Gayfer, Editor,
School Progress,
481 University Avenue,
Toronto 2, Ontario.

Brig. T. Graeme Gibson,
Director of Community Relations,
Atkinson College,
York University,
2275 Bayview Avenue,
Toronto 12, Ontario.

Dr. Edgar D. Gillespie,
Superintendent of Collegiate Institutes,
Saskatoon Collegiate Institute Board,
Saskatoon, Sask.

Mr. Norman M. Goble,
Canadian Teachers' Federation,
444 MacLaren Street,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. W. R. Gordon,
Manitoba Teachers' Society,
Winnipeg, 10, Manitoba.

Mrs. Elise Grossberg,
108 Glenayr Road,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dr. R. B. Gwilliam,
Department of Citizenship & Immigration,
Training Branch,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. Gordon Hancock,
Supervisor, Fitness & Amateur Sport Branch,
403 - 1181 Portage Avenue,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. P. J. Hanley, Deputy Minister,
Department of Education,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. J. Y. Harcourt,
Collegiate Institute Board of Ottawa,
662 Lyon Street,
Ottawa 1, Ontario.

Dr. Robin S. Harris, Dean,
Innis College,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dr. G. A. Harrower,
Dean of Arts & Science,
Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario.

Mr. R. Alan Hay, Chairman,
Prescott & Suburban Planning Board,
Hawthorne Farms,
Prescott, Ontario.

Mr. D. Hicks,
Canadian Bechtel Limited,
25 King Street West,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Thomas Hopkins,
Royal Commission on Education & Youth,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. W. A. Jenkins, Principal,
N. S. Agricultural College,
Truro, Nova Scotia.

Mr. Harold Kitney,
Board of Education, City of Toronto,
155 College Street,
Toronto 2B, Ontario.

Dr. A. Marino Kristjanson,
Director of Extension,
University of Regina,
Regina, Sask.

Mr. T. W. Latta,
Director of Continuing Education,
Board of Education,
P.O. Box 2873,
London, Ontario.

Msgr. Marcel Lauzon,
Department of Education,
Quebec City, P.Q.

Mr. S. M. Leggatt,
1895 Scarborough Crescent,
Port Coquitlam, B.C.

M. Leopold Legroulx,
Department of Education,
Quebec, P.Q.

Mr. R. D. Macdonald,
48 Brock Street West,
Tillsonburg, Ontario.

Dr. J. D. MacLachlan, President,
University of Guelph,
Guelph, Ontario.

Mr. Donald F. Maclean,
Dalhousie Institute of Public Affairs,
Dalhousie University,
Halifax, N. S.

Dr. Gerald Maher, Principal,
Don Mills Collegiate Institute,
15 The Donway East,
Don Mills, Ontario.

Mr. Gower Markle,
Director of Education & Welfare,
United Steelworkers of America,
1901 Yonge Street,
Toronto 7, Ontario.

Prof. J. S. Marshall,
Director of the Meteorological Observatory
McGill University,
Montreal 2, P.Q.

Mr. Armand Martel,
1660 Cote Signac,
Quebec 6, P.Q.

Mr. F. G. B. Maskell,
Eastern Ontario Institute of Technology
Faculty Association,
Lees Avenue,
Ottawa, Ontario.

R. P. Armand Masse, s.j.
Secretaire General,
College Ste-Marie de Montreal,
1180 rue Bleury,
Montreal 2, P.Q.

Dr. Leland L. Medsker,
Center for the Study of Higher Education,
4606 Tolman Hall,
Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

Dr. E. J. Monahan,
Canadian Association of University Teachers,
77 Metcalfe Street,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Prof. A. Montague,
Brock University,
St. Catharines, Ontario.

Prof. W. J. McCallion,
Director of Educational Services,
McMaster University,
Hamilton, Ontario.

Mr. Howard McCurdy,
Associate Professor,
University of Windsor,
Windsor, Ontario.

Mr. William F. McMullen,
Manager of Engineering Personnel,
Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd.,
Peterborough, Ontario.

Mr. W. G. McOvat,
6709 Laurel Street,
Vancouver 14, B.C.

Dr. Garnet Page,
Engineering Institute of Canada,
2050 Mansfield Street,
Montreal, P.Q.

Mr. Morley Patterson,
Phillips Electronics Ltd.,
116 Vanderhoof Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. William Pierce,
Director of Instructors,
Frontier College,
31 Jackes Avenue,
Toronto 7, Ontario.

Mr. R. R. Pinder,
Saskatoon Collegiate Institute Board,
Saskatoon, Sask.

Dr. Eldon P. Ray,
Board of Education,
Peterborough, Ontario.

Dr. R. E. Rees,
Department of Education,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. Ruben Richert, President,
Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation,
Box 1103, Saskatoon, Sask.

Mr. Alex Robb,
Assistant Superintendent,
Curriculum & Pupil Personnel Services,
Board of Education,
1235 College Avenue,
Regina, Sask.

Mr. I. M. Robb, Secretary,
Ontario Secondary School Teachers'
Federation,
1260 Bay Street,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. W. Claude Robbins,
President, Newfoundland Teachers'
Association,
9 Donegal Place,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. Robert Sabourin,
The Work Committee Group of Planning,
917, Mgr. Grandin Street,
Department of Education,
Quebec, P.Q.

Mr. H. Self,
Canadian Bechtel Ltd.,
88 University Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Gordon Selman,
Executive Assistant to the President,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver 8, B.C.

Mr. F.J.C. Seymour,
Alberta Teachers' Association,
11010 - 142 Street,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dr. W. M. Sibley,
Dean of Arts & Science,
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. Norman A. Sisco, Director,
Technological and Trades Training Branch,
Ontario Department of Education,
44 Eglinton Avenue West,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Douglas E. Smith,
Dean of Arts, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alta.

Dr. D. Stager, Dean,
New College,
University of Toronto.
Toronto, Ontario.

Miss Margaret Steed,
Canadian Nurses' Association,
50, The Driveway,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dr. Per G. Stensland,
Faculty of Education,
University of Saskatchewan,
Saskatoon, Sask.

Mr. E. F. Stephens,
Canadian Bechtel Ltd.,
25 King Street West,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Alan Stevenson,
140 King Street East,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dr. Andrew Stewart, Chairman,
Board of Broadcast Governors,
63 Sparks Street,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dr. A. M. Sullivan, Chairman,
University Committee on Junior
Colleges, Memorial University,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. A. J. Tapajna,
Hamilton Institute of Technology,
196 Westworth Street North,
Hamilton, Ontario.

Mr. W. Grant Taylor,
Special Officer, Continuing Education,
Lakeshore Regional School Board,
71 Second Street,
New Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. H. E. Thomas, Director,
Youth Branch, Ontario Dept. of
Education,
559 Jarvis Street,
Toronto 5, Ontario.

Mr. Ivan Timonin,
Economic Council of Canada,
P.O. Box 527,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Miss Helen Traynor,
Assistant to the Director, Women's Bureau,
Department of Labour,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Prof. W.B.S. Trimble,
Ontario College of Education,
371 Bloor Street West,
Toronto, Ontario.

Prof. A.S.R. Tweedie,
Director of Extension,
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, Man.

Dr. B. E. Wales, Director,
Adult Education,
Vancouver School Board,
Vancouver 9, B.C.

Mr. R.H. Wallace,
Executive Secretary, Canadian Association of
School Superintendents and Inspectors,
263 McCaul Street,
Toronto 2B, Ontario.

Prof. J. H.Whitelaw,
Co-ordinator of Modern Languages,
Sir George Williams University,
1435 Drummond Street,
Montreal, P.Q.

Mr. H.V. Wilson,
80 Norice Avenue,
Ottawa 5, Ontario.

Mr. John W. Yolton,
York University,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Elwy Yost,
M E T A
84 Queens Park,
Toronto, Ontario.